

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXII.]

FEBRUARY, 1860.

[VOL. XVI.]

THE ULSTER REVIVAL OF 1859.*

IN our former article on the recent Revival in the eastern part of Ulster, we described at sufficient length the origin, the object and the prevailing spirit of the movement. We have now to call attention to some details from which its nature may be correctly apprehended. We shall condense what we have to state into as narrow bounds as possible: but it is not easy to be very brief when a great many facts are to be enumerated, and when no general description will apply exactly to all cases and localities; for the movement varied at different times and places, according to the character and gifts of those who took a leading part in urging it forward.

The principal part of the "revival" was effected through the instrumentality of special meetings held for the purpose, and it may therefore be useful to give some account of the manner in which they were conducted. And this we shall endeavour to do as correctly as we can, referring generally to the authorities on which we rely, and begging our readers to bear in mind that the details were not always exactly the same, though in all there were of necessity points of resemblance.

In general it may be stated that few cases of what is called "conviction" occurred at the ordinary congregational services of the Lord's-day. We have heard of a few instances in which "conviction" was experienced during the celebration of public worship at the usual time and place; but in comparison with the entire number of persons affected, these were but as "the small dust in the balance." The principal instrumentality in diffusing the revival spirit and producing "cases" was that of prayer-meetings and fellowship-meetings specially devoted to the revival work; to which those who frequented them resorted with their heads full of the revival; and, not a few, with an earnest desire and wish that it might spread, and especially that they might be themselves then and there "revived."

The revival meetings were sometimes held in the open air; but these, though they were attended by immense numbers of persons, occasionally amounting to five thousand, (in no case, by calculation, exceeding ten thousand,) and therefore well calculated to extend and increase the excitement of the public mind,

* Continued from p. 31.

—were not by any means so productive of “cases” as those which were held in chapels, school-rooms and private houses. In these also it was remarked that if the meeting was thinly attended, few or no “cases” occurred; if the place was well filled, a certain number of “convictions” might be expected; if the crowd was great, if the atmosphere was suffocating, if the meeting was held at night, and if the proceedings were long protracted, a great number of cases might be counted upon with certainty. At some crowded, late and long-protracted meetings, nearly one-half of the persons present appear to have been “struck.” But such successes were by no means common. If the numbers of those who had been previously revived were deducted, we are convinced that the “cases” would, at most meetings, have presented a much smaller average.

The manner of conducting these meetings was usually as follows:—The minister or ministers, for frequently several were present, after engaging in singing and prayer, delivered a sermon, address or discourse, intended to awaken the hearers to a lively concern for the state of their souls. The writer of this paper was present during the delivery of one such address; it was plain, scriptural and practical, delivered with considerable power of language and earnestness of manner. But no apparent results followed. It was such an address as might be heard any Sunday morning in a hundred Unitarian congregations, except that it was spoken, not read; and it was listened to, as such an address would have been listened to in any of our chapels, with respectful attention; but though it is to be hoped good impressions were made on the hearts of some among the auditory, and any impression produced by such an address must have been good, still there was no more outward manifestation of a change wrought upon their spirits than would be witnessed in Essex Street or Portland Place. As bearing on the revival, it was a *coup manqué*. But this was by no means a common case as regards either the discourse or its effects. Archdeacon Stopford thus describes a discourse at which he was present: “The preacher’s natural qualifications appeared to be but small. His manner was cold, dry, unimpassioned. His voice was naturally good, and, like his action, appeared to have been carefully studied; his tones were unnatural, as if the peculiar cry of hysteria had been taken for a model. He did not appear to be possessed of either intellectual or sympathetic power.” In the discourse “there was nothing of the love of Christ, nor of the guilt of sin; there was *nothing to awaken conscience*; hell, *h—e—ll*, H—E—LL, was the one cry; and the sole object aimed at was to produce a sensation of intensified torture, of physical self-feeling. Remarkable as this sermon was for the paucity and smallness of ideas, it could not be wholly without ideas; *but passages were*. . . . The skill shewn in the wording” [of these passages] “was great, and the

whole object of the study appeared to be the elimination of every idea or thought. It was evidently here that the chief labour of preparation had been bestowed; and it was precisely here, where every idea had disappeared, that the preacher bestowed the whole force of voice, tone and gesture,—a fact which I had observed in other sermons before. . . . Precisely as I expected, when all sense and meaning were gone, the preacher had his base and unmanly triumph in evoking a wild and long-continued scream of hysteric agony, which, as it rose more loud and thrilled more wild, did effectually silence the preacher, and left him standing in his pulpit with a most self-satisfied air, until the removal of the stricken female enabled him to proceed.” (*Stopford*, pp. 39—42.) By far the greater number of revival preachers appear to have conducted their services on the same principle, and with similar result.

To this result the prayers, both those offered in private by the worshipers before they came to the place of meeting, and those to which they listened when there, contributed not a little. “It is notorious,” says Mr. Stopford, “that *hundreds of mill-girls in Belfast have prayed and are praying to be ‘struck.’* This was acknowledged to me by an elder or office-bearer in a place of worship famous for such conversions. It was also told to me by many of the mill-girls themselves. I need hardly say that such a prayer answers itself. *I say that they learn in places of worship to offer such prayers.* I was present, in a Presbyterian meeting-house, at a prayer, offered with the most frenzied excitement and gesticulations, ‘*that God would then and there descend and strike all the unconverted to the earth!*’ That prayer was accompanied throughout by a storm of cries and groans and exclamations and *Amens*, all having the true hysteric sound. This was the most frightful scene I have witnessed in my life. At the moment of the awful COMMAND to the Almighty to come down and strike, it was perfectly terrific. No such scene would be permitted in any Bedlam upon earth. Presence at such a prayer could be redeemed from guilt only by the purpose of warning. I have many terrible recollections of life, but this prayer is the most frightful of them all. I have been used to be calm in the presence of hysteria; I was calm then; but the physical effect upon myself was as if I had been drinking plain brandy.” (*Stopford*, p. 38.) It is evident that nothing can be easier than for any district-society or ragged-school committee that wishes, to get up a revival scene on this principle. Let them but gain access to a number of hard-worked, ill-fed and very unenlightened young people, especially females, and let them set a suitable minister to preach and pray in the style above described,—*any one could do so if he were wicked enough*,—and they will have a plentiful crop of “cases,” as sure as like causes produce like effects.

Is it wonderful that among a crowded assemblage of persons, drawn together in the desire of experiencing and the hope of witnessing the soul-reviving change which that hysteric scream of agony was universally believed to signify, some young and impressible female, attending on such an exciting service after a day of heavy toil in a mill or factory, having perhaps tasted no other food throughout the day, and almost to a certainty having had no other refreshment after her day's work, than a little bread and tea, (for such is the habit of most of the female workers in factories in the north of Ireland,) should yield to the emotions of alarm and fear which it was the aim of her spiritual guide to awaken? Is it wonderful that she should experience a dread and horror of that eternal torment which she was taught to believe would be her inevitable doom unless she should be rescued, "like a brand from the burning," by the immediate agency of God's Holy Spirit? Is it wonderful that these feelings should manifest themselves by the usual signs of deep emotion, by nervous agitation, paleness, sighs and tears, tremours, shrieks, convulsive movements? Is it wonderful that when one was thus violently agitated, others, her companions, equally predisposed, should catch the moral infection, with symptoms perhaps aggravated? and that nearly all present should be impressed in a manner to prepare them, unless they happened to be persons gifted with peculiar strength of nerve, for yielding to the sympathetic influence, if not on *that*, at least on some approaching occasion?

We see nothing in this that is not easily accounted for by the operation of the known laws of mind and body. To us the fact would seem marvellous if such phenomena did not manifest themselves frequently under such circumstances. There is nothing in these occurrences that any preacher of ordinary powers could not reproduce, if he were cruel enough to desire it, provided only that he could draw together a suitable auditory, and would stoop to use the needful appliances. Of this we have a singular example in the narrative of his own experience given by an American minister,—who, strange to say, appears quite unconscious of the infamous nature of the behaviour which he relates. After speaking of a particular convulsive movement with which several persons were affected during the progress of a religious revival, he says, that "during its prevalence *we made several experiments*; being inexperienced in the ministry, we knew not what to do with it. While preaching, we have, after a smooth and gentle course of expression, *suddenly changed our voice and language, expressing something awful and alarming*; and, *instantly*, some dozen or twenty persons, or more, would be jerked forward where they were sitting, and with a suppressed noise, once or twice, somewhat like the barking of a dog. And so it would continue or abate according to the tenor or strain of my discourse." (*Bodily Effects*, &c., p. 13.)

But the most terrific preaching would, we imagine, have frequently failed of its designed effect, at least during the revival of last summer, if it had not been aided by various auxiliary circumstances. Of these, the most efficacious was a crowd. Little could be accomplished in a spacious, well-lighted and well-ventilated building, and not over-thronged; especially during the day-time; but if a multitude could be got together in a place ill fitted for their accommodation, on a hot summer's evening after night-fall, all the doors and windows kept close shut, with few lights, and a succession of fear-inspiring preachers addressing the audience by turns,—with singing, prayers and the narrations of their experience by the converts,—for three, four or five hours without interruption, a plentiful harvest of cases might be confidently looked for. These helps were freely resorted to. One writer, who sees in the Revival movement “much that he would hope is the gracious work of the Holy Spirit,” says, “We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that, in some places at least, stimulants of a questionable and unwholesome kind have been made use of. It cannot be denied that, in some instances, the great attraction was a morbid desire of seeing physical manifestations, *the smiting down of converts*. Wherever this was anticipated, the multitudes flocked together. The more quiet ministrations of the regular minister gave place to the services of some great preacher, or some one fresh from the scene of revivals. On such occasions, other meeting-houses in the neighbourhood were closed, and large multitudes thronged to some one place altogether insufficient for so dense a crowd. The services were continued amid a suffocating atmosphere till almost midnight hours. I have passed young and old flocking into the meetings in the country at *six in the evening*, and have been met by anxious parents at *near twelve* the same night, asking me, ‘Had I seen any signs of their young people returning, and whether I had heard of any being affected?’ I learned subsequently that on that occasion some were so affected. It was no wonder. That night was intensely hot and sultry, and the meeting full to overflowing. I stop not here to speak of the impropriety of allowing or encouraging young people to be from under their parents’ roof at such hours of the night. And *twelve o’clock is early* compared with what we have read of elsewhere.” (*King*, pp. 18—20.) A revival minister gives the following account of one night’s operations as a sample of the rest: “The difficulty used to be to get the people into the church, but the difficulty now is to get them out of it. *One night and morning* we had three services. The first of these lasted three hours and a half. I pronounced the benediction, intending to dismiss the people; but no; they kept possession; only a very few left. After some half-hour, we engaged in prayer and praise again. I pronounced the benediction, intending to dismiss the people; but no; only a few left. Having attended

for some time to a number of weak and anxious persons, presuming that a third attempt might be successful, we engaged in prayer for a poor girl, who seemed to us to be dreadfully tormented—(and oh! the deep and universal fervour of that prayer—all prayed—very many wept)—and having sung to a plaintive air a portion of a prayer-psalm, for the last time that morning I pronounced the benediction, and left *between one and two o'clock*. Many remained.” (*Moore*, pp. 19, 20.) Verily, it is not surprising that the writer had “a number of weak and anxious persons” to attend to on that memorable night; the wonder is that there was only one “poor girl” among the hundreds present who seemed to be “dreadfully tormented.” The immediate result of this excitement is thus indicated: “Persons from England and Scotland and many parts of Ireland were to be seen perambulating the streets and lanes of Ballymena,” (and it might have been added, of Belfast and several other towns,) . . . “anxious to witness with their own eyes and ears this strange thing of which they had heard in their distant homes, *a half-dead soul revived by God’s spirit! a poor lost sinner with God’s ‘arrows sticking fast in him;’ his crimes over him like a thick cloud; his iniquities ‘a burden too heavy for him to bear;’ his heart pained within him, ‘the terrors of death having fallen upon him;’ fearfulness and trembling and horror overwhelming him; now crying, again shouting, screaming for mercy; again unintelligible to auditors; a modern Hezekiah, ‘chattering like a crane or a swallow.’*” (*Moore*, p. 6.) That some were silently impressed, that some who had been careless about religion and its duties, did, during the continuance of this epidemic, begin to pay more attention than they had formerly done to divine things, and that without passing through this “*crying, shouting, screaming*” process, we doubt not. Of the permanent good effects of a change so manifested, we are far more hopeful than we can be of the results of any fanatical terrors or enthusiastic ecstasies. But these cases were comparatively few. They were little regarded either by the revival preachers or by the multitude of the revived. It was not usually to such persons that “the strangers who flocked from England, Scotland and many parts of Ireland” were conducted when it was desired to bring before them specimens of the great work. Their cases were not trumpeted in newspapers, nor were their histories detailed in platform harangues, nor were they themselves paraded in crowded assemblies, nor were they called upon to address to their fellow-mortals the exhortation, “Go and do thou likewise.” No; these honours and distinctions were reserved for the “stricken,” on whom the Holy Spirit was supposed to have set his seal by subjecting them to some bodily disease more or less violent. And it was by the number of such that the success of the movement, and the usefulness of measures intended to hasten and extend it, were both popularly and pro-

professionally estimated. Of the light in which these physical manifestations were regarded, we might bring forward many proofs; we content ourselves with two. The first is from the *Banner of Ulster*, (a revivalist organ,) of Tuesday, July 5. "A feeling of devout attention pervaded the meeting, and *although* there were no decided physical symptoms of awakening, *yet* much good was apparently done." And the Lord Bishop of Down, who has lent his sanction and countenance to the movement, in an address delivered at a conference held to promote the work, found it necessary "to caution his audience against the *prevalent* but erroneous opinion that there had been no important influence of the Spirit, no real conversion to God, except in the cases of conviction which had been accompanied by an external influence upon the body." (*Salmon*, p. 36.) With such notions in their heads, intellectually and physically predisposed to yield to the strong excitement of the hour, subjected at the place of meeting to physical and intellectual conditions the best calculated to increase that tendency, terrified by the awful denunciations of the preachers, stimulated by the example of many, and warmed by the sympathy of all present, it was difficult even for robust men and strong-minded women to resist the impulse. We have been assured by several whose strength of mind we know, that when they heard the sobs and screams, and saw the looks of agony, and beheld the convulsive writhings of persons around them, sometimes in the same pew, or who had been seated on the same bench till they fell from it powerless, shrieking for mercy, it required all their fortitude and self-command to enable them to refrain from doing as others did. They would have felt it as a relief, if they had not known it to be a sin, to fall down and scream and "wallow foaming," as so many, sometimes a dozen at a time, were doing. We repeat, the wonder is not that so many hard-wrought, ill-fed, ignorant and impressionable young persons were affected in this violent manner, but that so many escaped the contagion.

We next consider the treatment to which the "stricken" or "convicted" were subjected. It is manifest that these affections of the frame, though produced in a great degree by mental excitement, constituted a morbid condition of the body, and required medical treatment, or at least the employment of the hygienic remedies applicable in such cases; among which, fresh air, copious affusion of cold water, followed up by perfect quiet for a time, soothing treatment during the whole stage of convalescence, and the absence, if possible for ever, of that excitement which had led to results so deplorable, are the most important and the most obvious. In a few instances, owing to the presence and the commanding influence of men of sense and science, these remedies were applied, and always with perfect success. But seldom indeed were such humane and rational means resorted to,

By the greater number of the revivalists it would have been looked upon as a stifling of the work of God to employ them. Archdeacon Stopford had made bodily affections of this class an especial study, and had attained to great eminence in the treatment of them. He came to Belfast, desiring to afford the aid of his knowledge and experience to those who were thus suffering. "I heard," he writes, "no cry in Belfast *which I could not easily have subdued*. I thought, on going there, that I might have been useful in this way; but I was told by those of the clergy to whom I offered my services, that *I would not be admitted into any house in Belfast* for such a purpose; 'that would be a quenching of the Spirit.' I found that this was true; and in public assemblies *where the object was to produce those cries*, the attempt was more hopeless still." (Stopford, p. 73.) "Many of these cases absolutely require medical treatment, *now sedulously excluded*." (P. 77.) "There is unfortunately a universal desire in Belfast" (and not in Belfast only, the venerable writer might have said, but in all districts to which the revival has extended) "*to exclude the physician from such cases*, a desire perhaps too readily acquiesced in." (P. 78.) In the absence of the physician, the actual treatment was in almost every instance and every point exactly the reverse of that which medical science would have prescribed. "The Rev. Edward Metcalf describes several of the cases which he saw as originally nothing more than cases of fainting under excitement, but which were worked into hysterics by keeping them *for two or three hours, as is the case frequently*, without any of the ordinary remedies which are used in such cases being applied; but instead thereof a very boisterous scene of excitement is carried on around them, in exceedingly loud hymn-singing and praying at the pitch of the voice." In one example which he gives, "a girl of about twenty years of age was leading some persons in most boisterous hymn-singing round another girl who had fainted at a meeting which had just closed, and who was evidently suffering under a hysterical affection; but this young person resisted even the authority of the doctor, who wished to have the girl removed to near the air and her dress loosened a little, saying that she had been 'a case' herself and understood it much better, and nothing was so good as hymn-singing." (Salmon, p. 35.) Mr. Stopford adds some particulars which introduce a new phase of the movement. He visited "a meeting-house famous for 'cases,' but which is supposed to be conducted, and is conducted, with more decency than some others. The preacher, before giving out his text, requested that if any 'cases' occurred, the congregation would be quiet, and leave it to the office-bearers of the church, who had made full preparation for their reception. While the preacher was urging, with the peculiar pointing of the hand" (at particular persons) "above described, '*Your case is as bad as hell can make it*,' (!) a poor

girl cried out and fell. In reproving the excitement which followed, the preacher said, '*God is doing his work in that individual.*' When the sermon closed, I obtained admission to the room to which this girl had been carried. It was small, and very narrow and stifling. No air, no water, was there. A more pitiable sight I never saw. This girl was about fifteen years of age, or perhaps a year or two older; her frame was weak and thin; her small hands stained and ground with hard work; her skin delicate and transparent; her hair and eyelashes long and dark; her neck marked with scrofula; with a highly intellectual face, seldom seen in her rank of life, and now made painfully interesting by the unearthly expression of cataleptic hysteria; every movement of her head and limbs, every expression of the countenance, every moan, markedly hysterical. She had previously been struggling and screaming, but was now quiet; her lips sometimes moving, but inaudibly. She had spoken of the devil catching souls to throw them into hell, crying, 'Away! you shan't have mine!' just the last impression made upon her failing mind. I learned that this was the third attack this poor girl had had in a short time, each succeeding one being more severe than the former. . . . She was seated on a form, reclining *in the arms of a coarse young man about twenty years of age.* He was no relation of hers, being ignorant of her name or residence. *He seemed employed for the purpose,* and related, with apparent glee, that before we came in it had taken all his strength to hold her in her struggles. In this small room, and gathered closely round her, were eight or ten young women, some of whom (perhaps all) had recently been hysterical, and two or three young men, (not related to her,) of whom one at least had been lately hysterical too. *No elderly woman was there, nor any elderly man, except one who came in once or twice during the hour we remained there. . . .* These proceedings *are fast wearing out all feelings of religious veneration, and of respect and decency towards the female sex.*" (*Stopford*, pp. 47—50.) The venerable writer never uttered a truer word. The meeting-house in which he witnessed this indecent scene was one of the most orderly and decorous of the revival conventicles. In others, girls of various ages, from seventeen to four-and-twenty, were to be seen lying on the floor, kicking in strong hysterics, with a ring of young persons, *chiefly young men*, singing, praying, shouting over them, for hours at a time, without the presence of any aged person of either sex,—encouraged to manifest their Christian affection for each other, as soon as "peace" was attained, by embracing and kissing each other,—the females often carried home, when the meeting was over, on the shoulders of the young men, the former still struggling and screaming, the latter singing hymns, and, when there was no necessity for lending physical support, permitted to accompany each other to their sometimes distant habitations at any

hour of the night or morning, sometimes at twelve o'clock, more frequently at half-past one or two. We violate no confidence nor reveal what is now any secret, when we state that the consequences have been in many cases such as might have been expected. Some of the young women whose conversion was last summer hailed with the most exulting triumph, and who were brought forward at public meetings to detail to others the experiences through which they had passed, are no longer in a fit state to appear upon platforms. This is a sad, but by no means the saddest, phase of the Revival movement.

It will have been seen from some of the extracts quoted in the foregoing paragraphs, that the fits of hysteria, which were looked upon as the certain symptoms of the work of divine grace, recurred more than once in certain cases. Indeed, there were but few examples of their occurring only once, and in almost all such cases the sufferers had been kept carefully out of the way of the renewal of that excitement by which the disease had originally been brought on. In some instances, even this was no protection. The recurrence of the deeply impressed idea, at home or during the hours of labour, was in some constitutions enough to occasion a return of all the violent symptoms, and these not seldom with increased violence. The exhibition of those symptoms generally sufficed to propagate the malady to others who witnessed them, by the force of sympathy, and the tendency which most persons feel,—though some are able to restrain it,—to imitate involuntary actions which they witness; such as yawning, smiling, sighing, shedding tears, &c. Hence during the revival almost all the schools in entire districts had to be suspended; all, or nearly all, the children, and in some cases the teachers also, being disabled by hysterical seizures from performing their respective tasks. Not a few factories and spinning-mills were obliged to stop work, all the younger hands having caught the infection. In the neighbourhood of Ballymena, usually a busy manufacturing district, the persons who resorted to the market for commercial purposes were for several weeks obliged to return home without doing any business at all,—workers, salesmen, clerks, being all either “revived” themselves, or busy in extending the revival. Mr. Moore, one of the ministers of the place, says,—“On my return after a two days’ absence, I found the town in a state of great excitement. *Many families had not gone to bed for two or three previous nights!* From dozens of houses, *night and day*, you would hear, when passing along, loud cries of mercy by convicts, or the voice of prayer by kind visitors, or the sweet tones of sacred song. Business seemed at a stand-still. In some streets, four or five crowds of people . . . engaged in prayer or praise, all at the same time. A large number of people had been metamorphosed into prophets and precentors. A goodly number of young men in business esta-

blishments in town, and not a few young workmen, gave up their entire time, day and night," &c. &c. (*Moore*, p. 5.) In manufacturing establishments, it was quite a common experience that if one or two, who had perhaps attended at a revival meeting till a late hour the preceding night, uttered a shriek and fell down in hysterics during the hours of labour, ten or a dozen cases would occur on that or the succeeding day, and more every day afterwards, till in a short time the whole of the workers were rendered unfit for their work. And it deserves notice, that among these were often found young persons who had been subjected to no religious excitement; who neither had nor pretended to have any deep anxiety about their religious condition; whose malady was totally unaccompanied with any religious impressions or ideas whatever, until these were put into their heads, or into their mouths, by the zeal of others, who, hearing of their being "struck," flocked around them, to sing and pray and glorify God. Such marked attentions bestowed on the "cases" stimulated a return of the symptoms in them, and tended to spread the malady still more widely. Explain it as we may, there was seen in many of the patients a relinquishment of the power of self-control, a submission to the exciting influence, at first voluntary in part and in part unconscious, but ending in a mental and bodily state in which the sufferer was utterly powerless to resist the spasmodic tendencies. It was remarked also that the stricken were, in their hours of recovered consciousness, greatly pleased by the sympathy that was shewn for them and the notice which they attracted, and that they seldom failed to shape their conduct and conversation so as to increase the interest felt in them by pious visitors;—a tendency which has been observed in other cases of hysteria.

It was natural for patients recovering from such a violent paroxysm to experience a delightful sensation of relief, and to express it in their countenance, tone and manner. There are few higher pleasures connected with the body more full of enjoyment than the return to a healthy condition after an attack of sore disease. This delightful feeling was, by the stricken themselves and by all the agents in the revival work without any exception, regarded as the certain sign that their sins were pardoned, that their souls were washed in the blood of Jesus, that the Holy Spirit had wrought a converting change upon their hearts, and that their everlasting salvation was secure. In short, they had "found peace." They were convinced, converted and renewed, and nothing more remained to be done for their spiritual condition by God or man. This conviction still more highly exalted their delight, their gratitude, their joy. It became now almost a necessity of their nature to manifest their ardent affection for their brothers and sisters who had passed through the same experiences. "The converts," says Mr. Moore,

“feel and manifest an intense love for each other. In fact, they cannot be happy out of each other’s society. Hence for the first week or two they were to be found gathered into particular houses, night and day, in companies, singing and praying; and at public meetings they will, if possible, be together. They do not care very much for any one who has not their towering love and zeal; but any person whom they consider to be one of themselves, a ‘brother’ or a ‘sister,’ as they say, they will receive with open arms. I have seen companions embracing their old associates in sin, now in Christ, with the deepest intensity of holy love. It was indeed greeting with an holy and a hearty kiss.” (*Moore*, p. 15.) Close akin to this feeling was “a deep anxiety, a tender compassion for the unconverted, the perishing,” which Mr. Moore compares to the compassion of Christ for doomed Jerusalem. “These youthful Christians, in the warm overflowing of their first love, tearfully plead with and for sinners to come to Christ; and when some poor, lost, blinded one has his eyes opened by the Spirit to see himself—that horrible sight—a guilty, polluted soul; and when in consternation he cries for mercy, joy pervades their countenances as they look at each other,” &c. &c. But they did not always select a proper occasion for the exercise of their zeal. “More than once have I been necessitated to cause young persons to be carried out of public meetings, to prevent utter confusion. From silent prayer on their knees, they would rise, and standing on the seats, the tears profusely flowing from their eyes, with all the anxiety of a life-and-death struggle, they would call upon sinners to come to Jesus, and upon God’s Holy Spirit to bring them to Jesus. This compassion for sinners, or [desire?] for the glory of Christ in their salvation, cannot be controlled.” (*Moore*, p. 16.) All agree that some of the stricken ones, at a certain stage of the malady or recovery from it, manifest a refinement and grace of feature, voice, motion and utterance, which they never possessed before, and often a wonderful readiness and propriety in the words in which they clothe their sentiments. This has been noticed by all observers,—by Mr. Stopford and Mr. Metcalfe, as well as by Mr. Moore, Mr. Adams and Mr. Seaver,—the only difference being that the former gentlemen state this to be one of the familiar and recognized symptoms of hysteria; the others regard it as an indubitable evidence of the power and presence of the Divine Spirit. In many of the converts there is a remarkable fluency in prayer, and a gift of speech in addressing others that amounts to real eloquence. The writer of this paper never witnessed a more winning display of Christian feeling and feminine sweetness than was shewn in a short address delivered, manifestly without premeditation, by a young female, who seemed to be in the rank of a factory girl, at a revival meeting. The only part of her discourse which it was impossible to

believe was that in which she spoke of her own bad heart and sinful state, until she was "smitten down," and then "found peace." No one who saw and heard her could think that her heart was bad.

The tendency of the state of mind into which very many of the converts were wrought or had worked themselves is to generate visions. Accordingly numbers of them were favoured with glimpses, and more than glimpses, of the celestial and the infernal regions. As might be expected, the Saviour is personally and frequently made visible to these, his especial favourites, in their trances. Mr. Moore declares that their views of him are "in some cases quite as glorious as that enjoyed by the apostle John in the Revelations, i. 13—16; and when thus brought by the Spirit 'into the chambers of the King,' and while 'his eyes chain them in the galleries,' there is in them, as in the apostle, almost no strength. A smile of celestial loveliness plays over the countenance, though perhaps naturally plain, and pervades it with a sweetness, a charm, far transcending the loveliest smile of the loveliest countenance on earth in ordinary circumstances. The hands are often raised upward, as if beckoning the Beloved to come, and then they are clasped energetically over the bosom, as if embracing him to the very heart. The feeling at the moment, whether uttered or unexpressed, is, 'O my sweet Jesus!' 'My Beloved is mine and I am his!' 'Tell me, ye daughters of Jerusalem, is there any Beloved like unto my Beloved?' These enjoyments are occasionally interrupted, apparently by some hostile agency. Then the countenance wears an angry aspect; the hands are energetically moved, as if to thrust the intruder away; and these or such words are uttered, '*No—I won't—I won't go with you;—away, away!*' In some cases, the conflict with the enemy is fearful, agonizing to both mind and body." (*Moore*, pp. 12, 13.) This writer does not mention, what however is perfectly notorious, that several of the converts profess themselves to be able, on awakening from their trance, to describe the scenes through which they have passed, or which they have witnessed in the spiritual world. In every such case, *the narrator is herself*,—for the visions are almost exclusively confined to females,—*the heroine of her tale*. "Visions and delusions of the sight or mind," says Archdeacon Stopford, "are one of the most ordinary phenomena of hysteria. Almost every girl now 'struck' in Belfast has 'visions,' and would be greatly disappointed if she had not: she would think it only half done, and would probably pray to be struck again. When the hysterical affection is mistaken for the operation of the Holy Spirit, these visions are naturally mistaken for revelations from God. . . . During my visit to Belfast, I sat by the bedside of a young woman,—'struck' for the third time,—recently cataleptic,—and, when I saw her, in a state of ecstasy. She was at first in prayer, with a remarkable power of utterance; then in thanksgiving for

spiritual operations in herself; then in ardent desire of visions and revelations; then describing aloud the vision as she saw it. . . . 'Oh! now it opens, and I see Him now, and He is beautiful; and, look! the angels open out, and He comes forward, and He comes to me; and what has He in His hand? Oh! it is a gown! and how beautiful it is! What a beautiful gown! And it is a gown of glory. And it is for me. And, look! He comes straight to me! And what is he going to do now? He is going to put it on me Himself! And now he puts it on! Where am I now? What a beautiful seat! No, no, it's not a seat. *I am sitting on the throne of God*, and Jesus is sitting beside me!' I visited her three days afterwards. She was recovering, but still very weak. She had a succession of visitors; for she was considered as one of the most wonderful cases. I expressed a hope that it was not too much for her. She replied, 'I am glad to see so many coming to me; for *I am not so wrapped up in my own glory, but that I think it good for others to pray for me too.*' I had heard that in every case the burden of sin is felt and bemoaned; she said nothing of this; so I put every question that could draw it out, and at last asked her plainly of it; it was quite evident, and acknowledged by herself, that she had felt nothing of this. I inquired about her future attendance upon public worship; she replied that *when she got proper clothes she would go, but not till then.* I told her of the warning in scripture against forsaking the assembling of ourselves together. I asked, would she have kept from Christ, when on earth, on account of her clothes? She replied that 'it was easy before Him, but it was hard to do it before man.' I pointed out to her the trial that she now was brought to, between conformity to the will of Christ and being governed by the fear of man. She said tartly that '*she knew all that, but that she never would go to a house of worship till she had proper clothes to go in.*' Her countenance was now dark and angry, and she shewed very clearly that she wished to have no further conversation with me. I left her with a sad feeling that her heart was unchanged and untouched; yet I have met with no case so much made of by ministers and ladies. I fear that great harm is done to persons so deluded. What can be more deplorable than that a soul, in this state of darkness, should be deluded with the belief in false revelations assuring her own salvation, *without one sign or evidence of true repentance?* Had not her own delusive visions set aside from her the teaching of the word of God?" (*Stopford*, pp. 50—54.) The Archdeacon gives an instance in which he heard the asserted visions of a similar enthusiast *quoted and commented on in a pulpit in Belfast as direct revelations from God!* (Pp. 54—57.)

We had intended to cite some farther examples, but we have trespassed long on our readers' patience. The moral results of the movement yet remain to be considered.

CRELLIUS "DE UNO DEO PATRE," WATERLAND AND BENTLEY.

IN the library formerly at Totteridge Park, Hertfordshire, which now forms part of the much more extensive library at Hartwell, near Aylesbury, is a copy of the English translation of the treatise of John Crellius, "touching One God the Father," with the enigmatical date at the bottom of the title, "Printed at *Cosmoberg*, at the sign of the *Sun-beams*, in the year of our Lord, 1665." The words *Cosmoberg* and *Sun-beams* are in red ink and in italics. A writer in the *Monthly Repository* (III. 14) says, respecting "this pleasantry at the bottom of the title-page," that "it shews the caution with which a work deemed heretical was sent forth, when the publisher could only venture to describe himself as a citizen of the world." A correspondent in the same volume (III. 142), in reference to another insertion at the bottom of the title-page of similar works, viz., "London: printed for *Richard Moore* at the *Seven Stars* in St. Paul's Churchyard," conjectures that it "affords another instance of the necessity that the friends of free inquiry of those times were under of resorting to a variety of expedients to preserve themselves from the animadversions of their illiberal and persecuting neighbours." Mr. Wallace, on the contrary (*Antitrinitarian Biography*, I. 155, 156, III. 185, 204, 205), considers Richard Moore as a real name, and it appears to me that he is in the right. During the Commonwealth, a bookseller, who favoured Socinianism, might venture to publish his own name. On the restoration of Charles II. this became unsafe, in consequence of which the same Richard Moore, or his successors, professed to edit similar publications at *Cosmoberg, the city of the world*.

The same translation appeared again with the following impress at the bottom of the title: "London: Printed, 1691." The fact appears to have been that the new title was then printed, but nothing more. On comparing the two editions, if they may be so called, of 1665 and 1691, I find a perfect agreement in all particulars, including wire-marks, printer's signs, paging, and errors of the press.

The above-mentioned copy of the original edition (1665) has been kindly lent to me by its present owner, Dr. John Lee, of Hartwell, for the purpose of noticing an entry which occurs on the fly-leaf before the title. This entry is in the handwriting of Dr. Lee's great-grandfather, the Right Hon. Sir William Lee, Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench. After relating the high repute of Crellius among the Polish Socinians, Sir William records the following fact:

"N.B. Dr. Bentley in my hearing at Trinity College declared he had advised Dr. Waterland to answer *Crellius de Deo*, and seemed to intimate that he could not do it."

Sir William Lee appears to have been much addicted to the

perusal of scientific and philosophical works. Although brought up as a member of the Church of England, it may be concluded from the notes inserted in his books, that, as he advanced in years and his knowledge of the world expanded, he became very tolerant and was favourable to Unitarianism, although he may never have made any public declaration to that effect. It is probable that, when Sir William Lee heard the preceding declaration, he was on circuit and was Dr. Bentley's guest, since Trinity Lodge, which was Dr. Bentley's abode, has usually had the honour of receiving the judges of assize.

I may add that in the Hartwell library there is a second copy of the original edition of this English translation of Crellius, and that others are in Williams's library, and in the library of Manchester New College; and having been thus led to bring in the name of Bentley as Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, I will refer to another anecdote in the life of that eminent scholar.

Bishop Monk (*Life of Bentley*, p. 644) gives the following account of the condemnation of Ducket, the atheist, who was tried in 1739 before the Vice-Chancellor's court:

"Upon the next court-day only eight heads of Colleges appeared in the schools; whereas a majority of the whole number was indispensably required to sanction the judgment which the Vice-Chancellor was then ready to pronounce. Dr. Bentley's liability to catch cold did not suffer him to leave his house; accordingly, in compliment to the Father of the University and the early refuter of atheistical tenets, the court was adjourned to Trinity Lodge. Here some persons, who generally condemned his words and actions, were scandalized at instances of levity, as ill suiting the solemnity of the occasion. Tradition in the University still records a jest then uttered by Bentley: he inquired of those about him, "which was the atheist?" and on Ducket being pointed out, who was a small and spare personage, he exclaimed, 'What! is that the atheist? I expected to have seen a man as big as Borough, the beadle,' a man of very portly appearance."

I remember hearing Dr. Parr tell the story as follows:

Bentley, having entered the room and having been informed which was the atheist, exclaimed with much energy, "When Jupiter was assailed of old, it was by mighty giants, Ægæon, Briareus and Enceladus. Shall then the throne of the true God be shaken by such a puny wretch as this?"

This version of the story seems to be more in character with Bentley, and to rest on equally good authority.

JAMES YATES.

Lauderdale House, Highgate, Dec. 17, 1859.

THE NATIONAL REVIEWER'S THEORY OF CHRIST'S RESURRECTION.

SIR,

THE letter of the *National Reviewer* in your last number, though it refers chiefly to another of your correspondents, shews me that I too had failed (whether through the reviewer's want of clearness or my want of intelligence) to apprehend his theory on this subject, as being distinct from that of Ewald. I erroneously supposed the reviewer to imply in his remarks that Ewald's views were essentially his own also. I therefore lose no time in rectifying my mistake and adding such remarks as his allusions to my letter seem to call for, treating him still, of course, *impersonally* as the anonymous *National Reviewer*, for the mixed orthodoxy and anti-supernaturalism of whose article I still, as earnestly as at first, desire that the Unitarian denomination should not, through the known genealogy of the *National Review*, be held responsible.

The reviewer, after saying that he agrees with Ewald's remarks on "the mysterious and fitful character" of Christ's appearances to his disciples after his resurrection, thus states the difference between their theories of explanation :

"In *accounting* for the impressions so strongly made on the minds of the disciples which led them to believe in the restoration of their Master to life, I differ from him. So far as I can make out his views, which he has shrouded in more than his ordinary obscurity, he considers the whole affair to have been what the Germans would call a *subjective process*, an intensifying into peculiar vividness of ideas and remembrances already in the mind, without being occasioned by any *extra-personal* influence. For myself, I do not think this an adequate explanation of the phenomena. I cannot account for the recorded change in the language and conduct of the disciples, without the supposition of some presence visiting them, which they recognized in some way inexplicable by us, as that of a real person from the invisible world,—an impression, therefore, which had a cause outside themselves, and was not a mere product of the working of excited minds. I call this a *spiritual* fact, from the want of any more appropriate term to express a reality made cognizable and certain to a human soul through some other avenue than the outward senses. The difference between my own view and Ewald's is, I should think, obvious enough. There seems to me satisfactory evidence that Christ's resurrection or ascension (*ἀνάστασις* or *ἀνάληψις*), whichever term we prefer to adopt (for I regard them as only different forms of expression for one and the same mysterious and unsearchable fact, his passage from the present into the next life), was so witnessed to the minds of believers (not through the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of some deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, than we are yet able to trace), that they were convinced of the perpetuity of his existence and of the reality of his occasional intercourse with them. My belief, therefore, in the *reality* of a resurrection historically attested is just as strong as theirs who take all

the accounts of the bodily re-appearance in the strictest and most literal sense. Whereas I cannot find that Ewald, though doubtless having a firm general faith in immortality, believes in any direct and extraordinary witness to a resurrection at all."—Pp. 36, 37.

I confess I had understood the reviewer himself to imply that the whole might be considered as having been a *subjective process*; and I thought this (as I now find he does) an inadequate explanation. It was under this impression that I referred to the replies already made to Woolston. "Subjective persuasion" I take to be the philosophical solvent of fact into fancy or history into myth. The historical facts of the gospel (including the resurrection of Christ prominently) I regard as essential to Christian faith, and their historical evidence as an essential of thorough Christian conviction. Hence my earnestness for the reality of Christ's resurrection, which astonishes the reviewer; it is not because I believe the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ to be a direct proof of our future life. Ewald evaporates this miracle, as Woolston did the whole history.

The reviewer's own theory, as above given in contradistinction to Ewald's, does not, however, satisfy me much better. The supposed "*extra-personal*" influence is not only undefined but even undescribed, and incapable apparently of intelligible description. He supposes "*some* presence visiting them, which they recognized in *some* way *inexplicable* to us, as that of a real person from the invisible world,—an *impression*, therefore, which had a *cause outside themselves*, and was not a mere product of the working of excited minds." But how were they sure it was outside themselves? is a fair question; and another is, How could they make us reasonably sure? It is not for me to deny the possibility of such *extra-personal* yet spiritual manifestations; and the reviewer does me great wrong to speak of me as "treating the supposition of any spiritual evidence of the resurrection as an absurdity;" still more, to make me say that the "access of the Father of our spirits to us through our souls is impassably closed up" (p. 40). What words of mine he alludes to, I cannot imagine, which bear this gloss and which he calls "offensive to the common belief of Christians." Were I, or the reviewer, to witness the same manifestation of the risen Christ as Paul did on his way to Damascus (which I take to have been a miraculous manifestation, and not wholly confined to St. Paul), I suppose we should "on equal evidence recognize as an objective reality the presence of a deceased person from the other world" (p. 41). But our question (in the reviewer's own words) has to do with the "*reality of a resurrection historically attested.*" And I confess I cannot see what historical evidence can be fairly admitted as credibly *proving to us* the reality of such a spiritual fact as the reviewer supposes. The bodily resurrection, as recorded in the Gospels, is a fair subject of testimony, to be tried

by the usual rules of testimony. But testimony to the supposed *spiritual fact* would amount, I think, only to this, that the person so testifying had a certain experience in his own mind which he referred to an *extra-personal* cause, but of which he can communicate no evidence, nor even clear description, to any one else. He therefore cannot satisfy any other person that this experience was anything but what the Germans call *subjective*, i.e. occurring in his own mind without any cause beyond the laws and operations of his own mind. I feel, therefore, that for the spiritual resurrection thus advocated, *no historical evidence can be brought that will or ought to satisfy my mind*. In order that I may partake that conviction, Christ must rise or ascend *to me*, as he is said to have risen or ascended to his first disciples individually. The process may indeed not have been in their case *subjective*; but if it cannot be shewn to have been otherwise, it might as well have been nothing else, so far as Christian evidences are concerned. We must each demand what Thomas so unreasonably did; and fail of being indulged as he was.

Let the reviewer be supposed to argue the case with Ewald. How will he prove that to have been *extra-personal* which Ewald regards as *subjective*? "*Some presence!*" (Ewald might reply); *what* presence, but that of their remembered Lord, as memory brought him back and faith exalted him? "They recognized it (you say) in *some way* inexplicable to us?" It is easily explicable to me (Ewald would say) as the working of their own excited minds; and in *what other way* can you even imagine it? You call it "*a spiritual fact*," designing by that phrase, you say, "to express a reality made cognizable and certain to a human soul through *some* other avenue than the outward senses." Again, *some* other avenue! What other? You define nothing. You make all vague. But be it so; still, how are they to make it certain (not being cognizable) to *other* minds? To *my* mind it is neither a subjective nor an objective reality through their mere narration of it. I admit it was *subjective* to them; but I must doubt its having been spiritually *objective* even to them, except as the modern American spiritualist finds Washington, Channing or his own relative, present when the proper *medium* is obtained. Indeed, the theory reflects the modern spiritualistic pretensions very closely. If Ewald or any one else should object thus, I know not what the reviewer could reply, unless he is prepared to say, As Christ's presence from the dead was manifested as a spiritual fact to each of the early Christians, so it has been spiritually manifested to *me*; and if it should become spiritually manifest to *you*, then you too will believe it. But this is abandoning the field of history and argument where we began with identifying the risen Christ. Is the reviewer prepared to maintain that this same spiritual fact of Christ's resurrection is *perpetual and universal*, — that the manifestation of the risen

Christ is a *constant law of the seen and unseen worlds*? For he says expressly that the persuasion was effected "not through the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of *some* deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, than we are yet able to trace." Yet he elsewhere speaks of a few rare and favoured moments when the veil has been pierced.

I do not know, by the by, why a miracle should be spoken of as a *violation* of natural law. When one natural law prevails over another, we do not say the first is violated. Gravitation is not violated, but overcome, by the natural power, whatever it be, by which the sap rises in the tree. Why should we say it was violated if Jesus Christ by special and supernatural power walked on the water? The natural law of disease is not violated when medicine prevails; why should we say it is when the miracle-working word of Christ prevails? Another and stronger power is brought into action, about which we may say something or may say nothing; but I would not say (for I do not know it and I do not think it) that any natural law is *violated*, but rather *overruled* by a higher natural law or by a supernatural will.

Let me here avow that I have no difficulty, as a Theist, in believing miracles to have been worked and inspired knowledge communicated through Jesus Christ and his apostles, at the will of the same beneficent Being who works continually in the powers of Nature. My acceptance of Christ's bodily re-appearance alive from the dead is in simple harmony with my admission of everything else miraculous about his ministry. I know not whether the reviewer denies the supernatural altogether; but if he does not in other recorded facts of the life and ministry of Jesus Christ, I do not see what advantage is gained to simplicity of theory by denying it in the instance of the resurrection. All the alleged miracles of the gospel history, including this, are, as described in the New Testament, of a kind that admits of testimony, for the conviction of others besides their immediate witnesses. They are all things addressed to the senses as well as to the mind. Even "the words that Christ speaks bear witness that the Father sent him," and he challenges those who do not believe his words to "believe his works." If, then, his resurrection were described in the New Testament as a *spiritual* fact only, it would be destitute of the evidence which belongs to all the rest. It might be fact, but not capable of reasonable proof.

The reviewer, in his letter to you, takes little notice of my main criticism, which I still venture to think is of chief importance in this question. I pointed out the scriptural fact that the ascension of our Lord is far less fully and circumstantially recorded and by a smaller number of historians (only by two, and those not apostles) than the resurrection. I said that his allegations and those of Ewald as to the vagueness and incompleteness of Christ's recorded appearances after death, would be much

more applicable to the scripture account of the ascension than to that of the resurrection, to which they have addressed the charge. For saying this, the reviewer invidiously tells you that I "all but throw overboard the New-Testament statement about the ascension." This is hardly fair.* I said nothing to warrant it. I said, as he does, "The ascension is the necessary sequel of a bodily resurrection." I not only "do not see how it can be got rid of," but I have never tried or wished to get rid of it. But I say now, as I have said already, that the scripture testimony on this subject is vague, shadowy and incomplete, especially when compared with the testimony to the resurrection of Christ. I believe it is unavoidably so. If his resurrection (his bodily resurrection and forty days' life on earth) was a fact, the testimonies would be, in the nature of things, so far *positive*. But the evidence of the ascension must be in a great degree *negative* and *inferential*. When Christ was seen again after death, it was thereby *known that he was risen*; when he was presently no more seen, it was thence *inferred that he had ascended*. There were no witnesses of the moment of his rising, but many of his having risen and being alive during forty days; and whatever witnesses there were of the moment of his ascension, the time following that event bore a merely negative witness to it by his being no more seen among his disciples. I repeat that what Ewald and his reviewer say of the vagueness of the history of the resurrection is far more applicable to that of the ascension. To those who had seen the risen Lord, his ascension was afterwards a necessary inference (as it is to us), whether they also had seen him in the act of ascending or not. I only propose to keep these two events separate (as the Gospels do) by an interval of forty days of well-attested bodily intercourse; whereas the reviewer still insists upon confounding or identifying them. Indeed, he does this more absolutely than ever in his letter to you, where he says (as already quoted), "There seems to me satisfactory evidence that Christ's resurrection *or* ascension (*ἀνάστασις* or *ἀνάληψις*), *whichever term we prefer to adopt*," &c. Now I prefer keeping both terms, and applying them, as the Scriptures do, to two different events, and judging of the evidence of each event separately. Here I seem hopelessly at issue with the reviewer, for I cannot admit his right to make the two terms interchangeable. To do so is politely to

* Elsewhere the reviewer says, my "peculiar cast of mind seems to disqualify (me) for doing full justice to views opposed to (my) own." It may be so with me, or with him; but if he consents to argue with me, he has no right (any more than I) to say it in disparagement of the opponent. My views also seem to him "in an unfixed and transitional state." Possibly; but they do not seem so to me. At least they have been long fixed in their present form. That the reviewer should send me (with another critic) to Mr. Holyoake to be *reprobated* for the *indecent* of affirmations never made by me, is, I think, a very low art in a scriptural critic of so free a cast as he. All these little arts of controversy were better avoided.

beg the question and ignore the gospel history. Indeed, that history is the chief obstacle in the way, and must be disparaged.

The reviewer is rather hard upon me in at once holding me responsible for all that Priestley and others have said about Christ's resurrection as a pledge of ours, and in also understanding me "to deny that the bodily resurrection of Christ could ever be, *or ever had been*, appealed to by intelligent persons as any ground of belief in human immortality." And to shew my denial of this last fact, he quotes my declaration that such persons "seem to me not to understand what they affirm." Then they do affirm it, at any rate. My allusion was not so much to what Priestley and others have written, as to what I (like the reviewer) have heard much more strongly stated by less competent but more dogmatic theologians. I alluded to the old Unitarian Baptist class especially, and my ministerial intercourse with them. For I think the reviewer overstates Priestley's meaning in the passages which he adduces. Priestley speaks of Christ's resurrection as "*a pledge and assurance of our own which it is the great object of Christianity to enforce.*" But I have met with strenuous unlearned assertors of the opinion that Christ's risen body was truly the *pattern*, literally and absolutely the pattern, of ours, and that his rising miraculously proves that we shall naturally. I say such persons do not understand what they affirm. I am not aware that Priestley ever affirmed anything tantamount to this. Quite casually I stumble upon this passage in his *History of the Christian Church* (Rutt's edit., VIII. 23): "The consequence" (of his re-appearances to his disciples) "was such a firm persuasion in them all of the actual resurrection of their Master, and *consequently* of the *truth of his promises* concerning his second coming, to raise the dead and judge the world (when they would again enjoy his society in a state of happiness and glory which would have no end), as carried them through difficulties and sufferings as great as he himself had experienced, and gave *such an establishment to the Christian religion* as that nothing in the power of its most violent enemies and of the world could overturn it." As in this passage, so in many which might be brought from Priestley and others, the resurrection of Christ is cited as proof of his *divine authority*, the *truth of his claims*, and the reliableness of *all his instructions*, including his doctrine of *eternal life*. It is in this view that I regard the historical fact of Christ's resurrection as fundamentally important, and not as a "direct witness of a life beyond the terrestrial life." The reviewer is therefore not intitled to say that "the restoration of his earthly body had no bearing whatever on the *only* point that was of importance," and that the *only* sense in which his resurrection can be religiously of value to the dwellers on earth was as enabling them "to behold the *σῶμα τῆς δόξης* which their risen Lord wore in heaven."

I cannot even grant that (as he insists) it is exhibited in this latter light by St. Paul in the fifteenth chapter of his first Letter to the Corinthians. I think that chapter is often made to say a great deal more than Paul meant; and that persons of the class I have already alluded to, make Paul's argument illogical by trying to get more from it than he put into it. I think his argument from ver. 12 to 20 is a simple refutation of the sceptical assertion "that there is no resurrection of the dead." There were philosophers at Corinth, as at Athens, who mocked when the idea was mentioned, and who said the thing was impossible and absurd. Paul therefore, having rapidly cited the testimonies to the resurrection of Christ as that which he "had delivered to them first of all," says to the Corinthian Epicureans and those who were infected with their notions,—If Christ actually rose, how vain is it to say the thing is impossible! Positive testimony must outweigh negative arguments. One fact disproves universal negation. Thus he logically answers the sceptic on the abstract question. In the 35th verse he meets the practical difficulty of the thoughtful mind which still curiously asks, "*How* are the dead raised up, and *with what body* do they come?" And this question he meets, not (as I read him) by telling *how* and with *what body*, but by pointing to one illustration after another of the infinitely varied operations of God, and suggesting that the fact may be so though we do not know *how*. *How* does a seed grow? You know not; but you do not deny that it does, for you see the fact. *How* shall we live again? We know not; but He who has promised that we shall, can "give a body as it pleaseth Him." I hold this to be the course of *reasoning* in that eloquent chapter, in which some persons think the apostle finds not merely a reply to the sceptic, but positive proof of human immortality, and not merely grounds for faith in God's infinite power and love, but a literal description of the body that shall be.

Before quitting this chapter, I must express my surprise at the reviewer's argument on p. 44, that because Paul uses the same word, *ἐφάνη*, for all the recorded manifestations of the risen Christ, whether to the apostles in Galilee during the forty days or to him years after on the way to Damascus, all those appearances must have been of the same kind. Surely this is a very forced argument. To me, who believe that the risen Christ was seen in bodily presence by Peter, then by the twelve, and after that by above five hundred brethren at once, then by James, then by all the apostles, and that the ascended Christ appeared afterwards by special miracle to Paul for his conversion, it seems perfectly natural that Paul should say, "Last of all *he was seen* of me also, as of one born out of due time." At least I know not how better he could have expressed what I understand him to have meant. Paul saw a miraculous vision; they had seen a risen man.

I am called upon by the reviewer "strongly to support" my "strong assertions" that to take Paul's visions of the Lord as the starting-point for an inquiry into the historical question of Christ's resurrection, is a "needless, if not wilful, inversion of the natural order of events." An *inversion* surely it is, as not even the reviewer thinks that Paul's vision of the risen Lord was the earliest in the order of events. I think it a needless inversion, and I think it not conducive to a clear view of the history; so I may perhaps be forgiven for the phrase "if not wilful," in reference to an inversion which seems to me only calculated to confuse the facts of the case and to serve a strange theory. My opinion is the stronger in reference to this inversion, because I deliberately hold that the first three Gospels were written *before the destruction of Jerusalem*.* Here of course I differ from the reviewer, and must be content very briefly to say why. The positive testimonies of Clement and Irenæus in the second century throw us upon *internal* evidence for the little time preceding. And of course the internal evidence appears differently to different minds. To me it appears simply impossible that our Lord's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem should have been written *as we have it* in the first three Gospels, except before that event occurred; for I know not how else to explain the presence, in that record, of Jewish expectations which were not fulfilled in the actual event. By the same criterion I am convinced that Paul's letters to the Thessalonians *must* have been written before the same event. So far as I know the literary history of ancient books, the authorship of the Gospels is quite as well proved as that of the *Æneid*, the *Metamorphoses*, the Gallic War and the Catilinian Conspiracy. So far as I can judge, the critical arguments which impugn the former would upset the latter. Thinking thus, I must consider it a strange inversion of the natural order of testimonies as well as events to begin the inquiry into Christ's resurrection (or any part of his personal history) with his miraculous appearance to Paul some years after his death, when we have two histories of his life written by apostles, and two others by men who had access to the earliest materials for a biography. The reviewer himself admits that the several Gospels "must have existed, and we find clear evidence of their materials *before*" the second half of the second century, when they are first distinctly alluded to. He also puts Luke long after Matthew and Mark, and John last of all, but still in the first century. Matthew and Mark may thus have been as early perhaps as I wish. But whatever theory we may hold respecting the earliest "materials," it seems to me that those materials, as now presented to us in

* The reviewer invidiously says, "As this is merely the opinion of an individual writer, unsupported by proof, we may set against it," &c. *Neither he nor I* have brought any proofs hitherto of our respective opinions on this subject. We have simply stated them. So far we are on a par in logic,

our Gospels, are the proper and only basis of our idea of *Christ's personal history*, including his death and resurrection. It is wilful to consult Paul on these subjects. It is doubtful whether Paul ever saw our Lord "in the flesh," though it is quite possible he may have done; but the vision which Paul had of him some years after his resurrection is, I must think, most arbitrarily and unnaturally taken as interpretive of what his biographers have said of his previous personality, whether before or immediately after his death. This is what I mean by a needless, if not wilful, inversion.

I must speak my whole mind plainly here. It seems to me that the historical character and the historical evidences of Christianity are wholly invalidated by the reviewer's theory, as well as by Ewald's. It seems to me that by simply extending the application of the same mode of argument, a Woolston, a Strauss or a Holyoake may call in question everything alleged to have been miraculous in the personal history of Jesus Christ, and may even reduce his earthly life itself to that of a phantom Christ such as the reviewer reminds us that the Docetæ maintained him to have been. The argument would run thus: "Paul had seen, by *extra-personal* but *not miraculous* manifestations, the ascended Christ. What Paul knew by these manifestations we take as the 'proper point of departure' for our knowledge of Christ, because Paul's Epistles were written before any of the Gospels. Now Paul does not give us any account of those miraculous cures and inspired sayings of Christ which the evangelists afterwards published. Indeed he scarcely alludes, in any of his letters, to any passage of Christ's earthly life preceding his crucifixion. Even in his preaching as recorded in the book of the Acts (which book is, however, no more reliable than Luke's Gospel in these matters) he makes little allusion to Jesus Christ personally except as then *risen from the dead*. His risen state is therefore *the whole gospel according to Paul*. But that risen state was a *spiritual manifestation to believers only*; whence we infer that the same was the case with all previous manifestations, which *gradually assumed the form of bodily appearances, especially as the fervour of the primitive faith abated* (p. 44). I conclude therefore, with those ancient spiritualists called Gnostics, that he had no real flesh, no real body, but only the appearance of it, and that he did not really die."

What could the reviewer reply to this? He himself brings the Docetæ into the argument, and conjectures that when these *knowing people* were "changing the earthly life of Christ into a phantom, the mass of Christians opposed to these fancies had a *strong motive*, operating perhaps *unconsciously*, to understand the traditional account of Christ's spiritual intercourse with his disciples after his death, in a more outward and corporeal sense, lest they should be used to justify applying to the terrestrial

ministry of Christ what was true only of his heavenly life." Then, according to the reviewer, it would have been a natural process of thought so to apply such expressions. The Docetæ had, on the reviewer's theory, just so much groundwork for their fancy which they had not on mine. A modern Docete has only to take up the argument where the reviewer has left it, and say that, unconsciously, the whole phantom life of Christ has been hardened into bodily and outward history.

But these Docetic fancies were early confronted by more literal and historical-minded Christians, who in point of fact, however, do not assert the reality of the resurrection with any such special emphasis as the reviewer's theory would lead us to expect. There is no appearance of its having been newly brought into the region of outward objective fact. The whole life, death and resurrection had been *alike* unrealized by these Gnostics, and the reality of *all alike* is insisted upon by others. An extract from Ignatius directly to the point will shew this: "Turn a deaf ear, then, as often as any one speaks to you *without* Jesus Christ (*χωρίς*), who was of the race of David, who was Mary's son, who was *really* (*ἀληθῶς*) born, and ate and drank, was *really* persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was *really* crucified and died (both those in heaven and on earth and under the earth being spectators of it), who was also *really* raised from the dead, his Father raising him, as in like manner his Father will also raise up us who believe in Jesus Christ, without whom (*οὐ χωρίς*) we have not the true life. But if, as some (being atheists, that is, unbelievers) say, that he suffered in appearance (*τὸ δοκεῖν πεπονθέναι αὐτὸν*), they themselves existing only in appearance! (*αὐτοὶ ὄντες τὸ δοκεῖν*), why am I bound?" &c. (Ignat. Ep. to Trallians, ii. 10—13.) A similar enumeration of the realities of Christ's life, death and resurrection, occurs in the same Father's letter to the Smyrnæans (i. 4—12). It is even more emphatic and minute than that above quoted. It shews that in his time (and he was martyred A.D. 107) the Docetæ denied *all the outward realities alike*, and the realists asserted *the reality of all alike*. There is no sign, I believe, of the separate and later hardening of the resurrection into outward fact, or of the evaporation of less than the whole by the Gnostic still. And the good Father, wittily as logically, evaporates his opponents in their own laboratory: "*they themselves existing only in appearance*"!

Another thing I must say, and with a seriousness beyond my own impression of the importance of the matter of comparison, but at the risk of seeming far too little serious to those who believe in its pretensions and also to the *National Review*. I can draw no clear line of distinction between the spiritualistic philosophy of the reviewer and that of our mesmerists, table-turners, clairvoyants, rappers, revivalists and others, who now arrogate and (as I think) degrade the name of "Spiritualist." I

suppose all these enthusiasts would, like the reviewer, indignantly repudiate Ewald's theory that what they attest is merely *subjective*; they all maintain that the communications received by them are "extra-personal," "having a cause outside themselves." They think it necessary to suppose "*some* presence visiting them, which they recognize in *some* way inexplicable by us as that of a real person from the invisible world." The very language of the reviewer describes their pretensions precisely. Are we then to put the gospel evidences on a level with the claims of the Plough-keepsie Andrew Davis and the Wilkinsonian visions? Should I ever find them on a level in my mind, I must certainly cease to regard Christianity as a divine revelation. At present I do look upon it (together with the preparatory steps of revelation) as in this clear sense "an isolated event, a fact *sui generis*, in the course of human affairs." If I could reduce it to the same *genus* with those spiritual facts which I now refer to the constant laws of the human mind and body, I might still maintain a high and noble Theism, but I would drop the name Christian, as I would shun that of Mesmerist or Table-turner.

I must hasten to a conclusion. But I cannot help reminding you, Sir, and your readers, that the substance of this same discussion appeared in your pages about three years ago as part of a larger one, purposely raised by the Rev. J. J. Tayler, "On the State of Religion in Germany and among Unitarians in England." (C. R., Oct. 1856, to Sept. 1857.) In the last of three very interesting letters addressed to you on this subject, Mr. Tayler, after describing the "Gustavus-Adolphus Union" of the German Lutheran and Reformed Churches, opened for home discussion the question of a possible closer union among ourselves, and suggested that this might be found in "the acceptance of the life of Christ as the type of our own." Incidentally he gave his reasons for not implying in his proposed bond of union the recognition of the miraculous in Christianity, though himself believing it, and also for not including any opinion on Christ's resurrection and ascension. (C. R., 1857, p. 94.) On this last subject he gave expression to views remarkably coincident with those of the present *National Reviewer*. The whole materials of thought thus offered by him were discussed, as he had requested, in a very amicable but thorough manner, by Messrs. Gordon, Greg, Solly, Freeman, H. J. Prescott, Higginson, Tagart and Long; by one or other of whom the suggested bond of union was declared (if I must not say shewn) to be impracticable except so far as already in practice, and the spiritual resurrection theory was critically called in question, but without evoking any reply whatever from Mr. Tayler. If any of your readers will be at the trouble to consult your volumes for 1856 and 1857, to which I have referred, they will find the sum and substance of this present discussion between the *National Reviewer* and myself,

with other topics of equal interest to English Unitarian Christians. They will also find in C. R., May, 1856, a most curious article on "Table-turning in Ancient Times," from Mr. Tayler's learned pen.

A UNITARIAN MINISTER.

THE UNITARIAN LAYMAN'S REJOINDER TO THE NATIONAL REVIEWER.

SIR,

PERSONAL discussions in your pages are undesirable, and if in my letter in your December number I departed in any way from this principle, and referred more directly than I should otherwise have thought of doing to the author of the article on the Apostolic Age in the *National Review*, it was, as I explained, solely on account of the public position which he occupies, and because I feel that if the Theological Professor of Manchester College chooses to address the world on subjects so directly connected with the office which he holds, he has no moral right to assume the incognito.

But though I think that questions affecting the resurrection of Christ and the authority of the gospel narratives, and the manner in which these questions are dealt with by the Theological Professor of Manchester College, may be fit subjects for discussion in your pages, I have little disposition to occupy the attention of your readers by much notice of those portions of the recent letter of your correspondent which are personal to myself. In the previous letter which appeared in your columns, I quoted largely the reviewer's own words, stated the inferences to which they appeared to me to be open, and left to your readers the opportunity of judging whether those inferences were legitimate or not. Your correspondent has, generally speaking, adopted with regard to me a different course, and has spoken of me in terms which are rather the expression of his own opinions than deductions supported by any argument. Such opinions from some quarters would have given me serious concern, and led me anxiously to review the course I have taken. But men to whose judgment I attach higher value than I do to that of the reviewer have expressed their approval of what I have written, and as they have thought me in no degree obnoxious to the imputations which the reviewer brings, I regard with great indifference the terms which he has applied to me. The real offence which I have committed in the eyes of the reviewer is that, exercising my own judgment, I have stated in your pages what I believe to be the insufficiency and weakness of the arguments, and the unsoundness of the conclusions, which have been brought forward

in the pages of the *National Review* upon some subjects of the highest interest to mankind. On these subjects the reviewer, at all events, has put forth opinions at variance with those which have been held by men his equals in learning, his equals in freedom of thought and action, and in my belief far his superiors in mental power, and which are also held, I believe, by men as conversant as the reviewer with the learning of the present day. In connection with these subjects I have further raised the question, painfully forced upon myself, whether the manner in which the reviewer has dealt with them in his published writings does not indicate his unfitness at essential points for the important public office which he fills. If in examining the opinions of the reviewer, and the grounds upon which they rest, I have failed to make out my case in the judgment of your readers, my failure will have its own reward. But the question will not be settled by the opinions expressed of me by the reviewer.

One or two remarks it may perhaps be well that I should make. With reference to the imputation of dogmatism, the objections I made are not to the holding of any particular opinions, but to unfairness of statement and unsoundness of argument, qualified in every instance by the declaration that I believe such unfairness to be unconscious, not intentional. I am further told that of the reviewer's teaching I have no means of judging. What I said had reference to his published writings. But in the foregoing statement, as in some points of much greater importance, the reviewer has made a most extraordinary assumption; the fact being, I believe, that few people living have had a larger experience of his teaching than myself, or, I will venture to add, have listened to it with greater interest or warmer personal attachment. Its excellences at many points, which I have ever gratefully recognized, have not made me blind to defects which may, I fear, be essentially mischievous in the position which the reviewer now occupies. I wish also to say that as the terms in which he has spoken of me have given me no concern, they will, I can assure him, have no place in my recollection. I well know that it must be a source of sorrow to him that one who was once his pupil, and has long been his friend, should publicly appear as his opponent. If this has been painful to him, I can assure him that it has been painful to me. But I do not hold that personal friendship is a ground for failure in the discharge of duty. When the reviewer stated doubts as to the authority of the gospel narratives of the resurrection, I felt it right to examine the grounds on which he did so, and I am not prepared, under his censure, to withdraw a word of what I have written.

The reviewer says that I have been writing on subjects of which I am imperfectly informed, and intimates, not very indirectly, that it might have been as well had I remained silent. On this point I have a few words to say. I make no pretension

to be in learning the equal of the reviewer. It would be absurd in me to do so. The advantage to society of the existence of a body of clergy (and I would not be understood as undervaluing the clerical profession when I say that it is the only advantage I know of) is that, being regularly instructed in the knowledge of religion in the large sense of the term, and making the study and teaching of religion the main duty of their lives, they may give to the subject that special attention which, in the necessary division of human occupations and duties, tends to the attainment of excellence in each, and which, in the particular case before us, is especially valuable for the attainment of those qualifications which may enable some men to be the instructors of others in the paths of duty and happiness. On this ground I am an advocate for the maintenance of the clerical profession, and for a national religious establishment, which shall supply the means of religious instruction without compelling the acceptance of it in any particular form. But if the principle is to be carried to the extent that professed theologians alone are to judge of religious questions, this, I may remark, is the ground upon which the Church of Rome excludes the laity from the reading of the Bible, and on which Pusey and Newman have maintained that the people are not to judge upon questions of belief except under the superintendence and guidance of the clergy. The learning of your correspondent I trust that I hold in all due respect. Upon his conclusions I take the liberty of judging for myself; and where in his published writings he appears to me to state questions unfairly or draw conclusions unwarrantably, I shall take the liberty of entertaining, and, if I think fit, of expressing, dissent. The article in the *National Review* appeared to me remarkable for glaring defects of statement and argument. The grounds on which I thought so have been placed before your readers, and it is unnecessary that I should refer to them again, except for the purpose of stating that the subsequent letter of the reviewer has in no degree qualified the opinions which I have expressed, though it has undoubtedly made some points clear which the article in the *National* left very much otherwise. When the reviewer declares his belief in the resurrection of Christ, which was however, in his view, not a bodily resurrection, but the appearance of a spiritual form, I must declare that with such a view I can have no sympathy, and can entertain no high opinion of the soundness of the reviewer's judgment or the clearness of his perceptions. I am at a loss indeed to discover upon what support, save the imagination of the reviewer, such an opinion can rest at all. That which the reviewer now states as the opinion of Ewald apart from his own, is to me far more clear and intelligible. Ewald, according to the statement of the reviewer, holds that the resurrection of Christ from the dead is not supported by satisfactory evidence. The reviewer declares his belief

in the resurrection, whilst denying the fidelity of the narratives upon which the resurrection depends as an historical fact. Briefly, as I have in substance stated before, the adoption of the reviewer's views as to the gospel narratives would involve with me the rejection of Christianity as a divine communication from God to mankind, and the substitution of Deism in its place. Admitting the reviewer's premises, my conclusion from them must be that of Ewald, not that of the reviewer.

Whether the teaching of the reviewer in the Theological Chair of Manchester College may be in accordance with his style of writing in the *National Review*, I can have no knowledge. Generally speaking, I should say that any defects of statement which appear in the written words which a man deliberately gives to the world, are far more likely to exist in oral instruction; and of such defects the pupils who trust to him without other guidance are far more likely than any one else to be unconscious.

I assure the reviewer that I have as little inclination as he can have to pursue the question with him. Whilst I have listened during many years with high gratification and advantage to his teaching upon all subjects connected with practical Christianity, I have never been able to find either pleasure or instruction in his theological speculations. Happily, these were not often brought before his congregation, and what I know of them is in some measure derived from writings understood to be his in periodical publications, where, however, unless when I am led to do so as a necessary duty, I have long ceased to read them.

In directing attention to the subject, my object has been answered, and I now leave the judgment of these questions in the hands of your readers. Again expressing my warm personal regard and friendship for my opponent,

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN UNITARIAN LAYMAN.

Singleton, Manchester, Jan. 6, 1860.

P.S. Since the foregoing was written, I have learned accidentally that the reviewer has felt aggrieved at a supposed imputation in my former letter of unfaithfulness as a teacher. Now unfaithfulness as a teacher implies, I apprehend, the intention or the consciousness of teaching unfairly. This I never, in word or thought, attributed to the reviewer. In my former letter I said (C. R. p. 717), "Intentional unfairness in argument I have never for one moment thought of imputing to the excellent person who is the subject of my present remarks." I beg now to assure him (though I should have thought it almost needless) that I had just as little idea of imputing to him intentional unfairness in any way.

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. IX.

“Rejoice in the Lord” (Psalm xxxiii. 1).

REJOICE in the Lord for ever,
In the Lord for ever rejoice;
Devoutly listen wherever
Is heard his whispering voice;
For oft that voice is speaking
In tones most sweetly soft,
In thunders sometimes breaking,
In sacred silence oft.

In moving constellations
That circle their spheres above;
In marvellous manifestations
Of music and life and love;
To the worthless audible solely
In the boisterous cataract's fall;
To the humble, the pure, the holy,
Heard everywhere, heard in all.

No. X.

“Now let me die” (Kings xix. 4).

“Now let me die!” the prophet said;
Enough of life, its wants and woes;
Where my forefathers trod I tread,
And would repose where they repose.

“Now let me die!” the good may say;
The pilgrim and the pilgrimage
Have reached the hour of life's decay,
And tremble 'neath the shocks of age.

“Now let me die!” the Christian cries;
The world is fading, and I see
Bright angels beckoning from the skies,
And opening gates of heaven for me.

“Now let me die!” When Jesus' voice
Shall call to immortality,
In the blest summons I'll rejoice,
And meekly answer, “Let me die!”

DAWN OF THE NEW REFORMATION IN ITALY.

SIR,

STUDIES in which I have for some time been specially engaged in connection with the Papacy and its influences have left in my mind an undoubting assurance that at least in its political relations it is hastening to its doom. The same studies have given me an intense desire for its downfall; for beyond a question fearfully baneful is its operation on individuals and society, as will fully be shewn in my volume on "*The Confessional*" about to issue from the press. Among the indications of the tottering condition of the Papal throne which I have lately seen is an instructive essay in *Le Lien* of Nov. 26, 1859, written by Mons. Etienne Coquerel. Having myself found its contents interesting, I send you the substance of them in a translation, not doubting that they will prove interesting to your readers.

Manchester, Dec. 9, 1859.

JOHN R. BEARD.

IN the 16th century there was a flourishing and harmonious Italian church, but persecution destroyed it, and all the members who did not perish sought a refuge, which did not fail them, in England, Switzerland and Germany. After that, there was not the least trace of Protestantism in all the Peninsula, except two small communities at Leghorn and Venice. For more than two hundred years, English and German merchants had been drawn within these commercial towns for business purposes, and when there united in worship. Without being actuated by any great sympathy with Protestantism, the Tuscan and Venetian governments had left them alone, the interests of commerce prevailing over those of fanaticism. These two communities still exist. At Leghorn the number of Protestants is 650, and the worship is conducted in German and French. At Venice the community consists of 400 members, and depends upon the ecclesiastical association at Vienna. The worship is conducted in German, in an ancient Catholic church which the Protestants bought before Venice belonged to Austria. Forty years ago these congregations and the Vaudois church were the sole representatives of the Protestant faith in Italy. There were, however, Protestants in several other towns; but not before 1820 were they able, in Turin, Florence, Rome and Naples, to connect themselves with the embassies of the Protestant powers, and thus to acquire an existence somewhat less precarious. At Rome, the church is under the protection of the Prussian ambassador, whose chaplain officiates as pastor to the community. They possess a very convenient chapel, a school, a hospital, and several other charitable institutions. The permanent members of the congregation number about 150; however, many strangers join at certain seasons of the year, and at Christmas and Easter the average number of communicants is about 300. The service of

the church is conducted in German and sometimes in French. There is also outside the gates of Rome an English chapel. The Papal government tolerates its existence, but only until it can be put down without danger; meanwhile, the government interdicts any manifestation which would place Protestantism before the public. Thus in case of the death of a Protestant, the friends are prevented from placing an inscription upon the tomb in any way indicating the religion of the deceased; all passages of scripture are forbidden for the same reason.

At Naples there are 700 or 800 Protestants, who possess a church and maintain a French pastor; however, in consequence of being connected with the Prussian embassy, they enjoy the services of the ambassador's chaplain. There is also an English congregation in the town, which has for its minister the chaplain of the British embassy.

In Sicily they have not yet succeeded in organizing a permanent German congregation. However, at Messina, where about 100 German and Swiss Protestants live, there is a theological student of German origin, who officiates as both schoolmaster and pastor. This congregation is often enlarged by English families who take up their abode at Messina for the season.

There is an English chapel at Palermo, but in the two last-mentioned towns the Protestant services are not officially recognized, and they content themselves with a simple private worship.

There were a certain number of Protestants among the Swiss troops of the King of Naples, who endeavoured for a time to re-establish a system of charity, regulated and recognized by the government. But their efforts were in vain.

At Rome it is much the same; some Protestants who are engaged in the foreign regiments of the Pope generally conceal their religious position.

It is doubtful whether the Papal government ignores the fact of having Protestants in its service; but at least it acts as if such were the case: for in case of illness or death the soldiers are strictly prohibited from seeing any minister of the Protestant faith.

There are more Protestants in the north of the Peninsula than in the south. We have already mentioned the two ancient churches of Leghorn and Venice. There is also one at Florence, which has been connected with the Prussian embassy since 1827, which consists of 300 members. The service is conducted in German, French and Italian, by their pastor, M. Shafter, of Berne.

There are 1000 Protestants in Modena, 300 in Parma, 40 in Bologna and in Reggio, 44 in Ancona; but all are nearly destitute of religious resources.

Fortunately this is not the case at Milan, where there are 400 or 500 Protestants, mostly of German origin. Until 1848, they

had only private worship; but the events of that year enabled them to invite as pastor a M. Kind.

When the Austrian armies returned to the capital of Lombardy, the clergy wished to prevent the continuation of this service. But Marshal Radetsky, having a more liberal mind, determined that this should not be allowed. He placed the community under his protection; and the clerical opposition had to yield before his all-powerful will. The service is now conducted in French and German. Bergamo for fifty years has had a congregation of about 200 members, the majority being foreigners, for whom the service is conducted in German and Italian. Lastly, for a long time, there have been two French Protestant settlements at Genoa and Nice. All these communities, as the reader will observe, have in common the feature of being composed of foreigners, and not Italians. Except in one or two places, the worship is conducted in a foreign language. Thus for many years little influence has been exercised upon the mass of the population; and it is certain that if a Protestant movement broke out at the present moment in Italy, the glory and responsibility would belong rather to foreigners than to Italians.

During the last ten years, however, Italy has seen other churches form themselves within her borders. Put in possession of full liberty, the Vaudois have built temples at Geneva, Turin, Pignerol, &c.; and the authorities of the churches have made known to the world what has been effected by their members.

However, it is not likely that the Vaudois church is called to play a prominent part in the evangelization of Italy; many circumstances oppose it, besides the fact that the mass of the Vaudois population speak only French. The establishment of these temples has exercised, nevertheless, a good influence upon the people. The mere fact of their existence has shewn many Italians that there is such a thing as Protestantism.

By the side of the Vaudois church in Piedmont some purely Italian congregations have established themselves. M. de Sanctis presides over the one at Turin, and M. Mazzarella at Genoa. Their influence upon their countrymen is so marked, that lately in Montreux (Canton de Vaud) a meeting of 50 Italian converts took place, to deliberate upon the means of propagating their new faith in their native land. Scarcely a year ago this religious movement was entirely confined to Piedmont. It had, it is true, extended a little into Tuscany; and there are some small congregations in Pisa, Florence, and some other villages and towns of the Grand Duchy. They had outlived the persecutions connected with the affair of the Madiāi; but the constant surveillance of a subtle police prevented the movement from extending. Since the war all has changed. The Duchies and Legations have proclaimed liberty of worship and the legal religious equa-

lity of all citizens. Our Italian co-religionists have with a rare energy availed themselves of this liberty so new to them; and the religious societies of Switzerland, France and England, have lent them the only assistance which, on the part of Protestant foreigners, can be really useful to Italians. They have furnished them with religious books and Bibles in abundance.

A correspondent of the *Times* writes to that paper from Florence—"I have seen in Parma, Bologna and other places, signal proofs of the activity of the London Bible Societies. Beautiful editions of the Diodati Bible, or the Protestant translations of the Old and New Testament, are sold at a very low price, or distributed gratuitously by the agents of these societies."

The Geneva Journal confirms these facts. A correspondent writes to it from Turin—"In the neighbourhood of Forli, a pamphlet, entitled *Christ without the Pope*, has been circulated and much read among the people. This pamphlet is very simple and at the same time very religious."

This diffusion of Protestant books, so eagerly caught at by many, has already produced results sufficiently considerable to shew how well the ground has been prepared. At Milan the worship is celebrated with a publicity unknown at the time of the Austrian dominion. And the Official Gazette of that city published so favourable an article upon these Bible Societies and their operations, that the Ultramontane French primal *L'Univers* uttered thereupon cries of rage.

In Tuscany, however, a very considerable Protestant outburst has taken place. The *Magazin de Librairie* (25th of July) says, "There are already more than 20,000 new converts in Tuscany: this is really enormous, when we take into consideration the hindrances which the government has placed in the way of the missionaries.

"It is not in the higher classes of society where Protestantism makes the most converts, but in the middle and especially among the lower classes. Meanwhile the sect which has undertaken the conversion of Tuscany is the most rigid of all the sects of Protestantism. It proscribes the clergy, and in consequence religious ceremonies: every Christian is a priest, and every place may become a temple. The spirit of Puritanism is revived in its followers, and I ask, how can they obtain any success among a poetic people, in a country where everything addresses the imagination, the inhabitants of which have always been somewhat paganish, and where there is no faith except in a visible religion? If the Italians turn to Puritanism, we must indeed believe they are changed."

The Protestants of Tuscany being free and numerous, wished to put themselves in possession of all their rights, and accordingly have set about erecting a place of worship. An elegant structure is rising in Florence upon the Piazza Barbano, which

is called also the Place of Independence. It is destined to become a temple dedicated to the worship of the *National Italian Church*, or the *Reformed Catholic Church*. Thus a congregation separated from the established Catholic Church already exists in Florence, and since last April the Protestant service has been conducted publicly in the Italian language.

In this movement the laity are not left to themselves. The clergy, especially in the lower ranks, participate in it. We find on this point some curious statements in the Genevan journal :

“What must greatly contribute to disquiet the clergy, is the fact, that by the side of the Protestant tendency, properly so called, there is another tendency very prominent,—a tendency to renovation, nay, if you will, to revolt, among the ecclesiastics. At Milan, Florence, and even at Turin, the priests profess openly what is called the *Catholic reformation* of the church.

“In Piedmont, Lombardy, there are 100 priests, more or less known, who have separated themselves from the episcopal government, and who act and write in a most liberal way. At this moment the people of Florence are erecting an edifice which has been named the *National Church*. The Florentine people are very interesting and very intelligent, and receive these demonstrations of religious liberty with great pleasure.” “Even in the states of the Pope the movement against the ecclesiastical authority is extending.”

It is now seen that the north of Italy is in a state of religious ferment. We do not see only small isolated congregations formed of English and Swiss merchants, who celebrate their worship in a foreign language, but purely Italian congregations are arising on the same ground. A religious question has been put before the nation, and an important movement already agitates the country after only a few months' liberty of conscience.

We will not say, with the correspondents of several foreign journals, that the King Victor Emmanuel, threatened with an interdict from the Pope, is prepared, in case the Pontifical thunder-bolt strikes him, to abjure the Catholic faith; and that the whole of his people would become Protestants together with him.

We do not seriously believe these rumours, nor do we like conversions dictated by political considerations. But without indulging in these dreams, actual facts suffice; and we hail with joy the serious movement which is bursting forth in a country for which the Protestant faith would be the greatest of benefits, and which has shewn itself worthy of the boon.

Intelligence from Florence, dated the 30th of November, 1859, states that the Evangelical movement in that city daily acquires larger proportions. More than a thousand Italians assemble every Sunday evening for public worship in a hall which serves for a chapel. The new community are impatiently expecting more capacious accommodation. It comprises at least three hun-

dred communicants. The Sunday anterior to the date given above, some thirty ministers took part in the services. Similar meetings have been organized in the principal cities of Tuscany and Romagna. On all sides Bibles are distributed. With peculiar satisfaction we learn that the new congregations have no authoritative creeds, nor any clergy regularly consecrated; their ministers simply declare that their faith rests on the gospel, under the aid and guidance of free inquiry. Their most highly gifted preacher is Mazzarella, of Naples. Besides the Sunday services, several meetings take place during the week.

While Italy offers so many and so marked signs of religious revival, France is by no means without tokens of the approach of a brighter day. To say nothing of the anti-papistical tendency of Louis Napoleon's Italian policy, the efficiency of which is attested by the episcopal alarms and agitation lately obtruded on the public view, we find in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, which, standing at the head of the periodical literature of France, is the sole voice of the press that retains something which approaches real liberty, unmistakeable indications of the decline of Romanism in popular favour, and of the coming-in of a purer and more living form of Christian faith. A few months since, Mons. Rénan, an author of high repute, who has largely contributed to the influence of Dr. Channing's works in France, published a very superior translation of the book of Job. An elaborate review of this valuable contribution to French theological literature lately appeared in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*. To the surprise of thousands and to the gratification of hundreds, the essay bore as the name of its author the signature of *A. Réville*. The surprise and the gratification arose from the fact that the writer is a well-known Protestant clergyman. Never before had a Huguenot minister been permitted to contribute to the pages of the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, the great national Review of Catholic France. Moreover, the Rev. A. Réville holds a high place in the liberal section of the French Protestant Church; in other words, his cast of thought is essentially and thoroughly Unitarian. The importance of the fact is anything but lessened by the outcry raised by the appearance of his admirable essay in periodicals devoted to French Protestant orthodoxy.

However, in the number of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* published on the 12th December, 1859, a more decided demonstration of the leaning of its conductors makes its appearance. In a critical notice of two devotional works by a Protestant lady, M. Emile Montégut uses these remarkable words: "For myself, I will boldly declare that I have felt true satisfaction in reading these two consolatory books, written by a Protestant pen. I am delighted to see that they have been inspired by the religious doctrine which is accounted by the vulgar as the most pedantic, austere and frowning—that which gives religious consolation most coldly and most grudgingly. I have long known that these

are calumnies, and very happy am I to meet with a proof which confirms my sympathies. Noble Church, which in the midst of universal decay still countest among its members so many loyal and valiant souls! Courage! One way or another, a great future is reserved for thee! We speak in parables, and in a way not to be comprehended by the profane, but to be understood only by those concerned." Here follows the parable. The conversation in which Jesus asks Peter, "Lovest thou me?"—one of the Papal commonplaces—is the theme of this apologue; in which Christ is made to utter severe reproaches against Peter, the chosen representative of the Catholic Church, saying, among other things, "Pharisaism shall seize thee; thou wilt persecute the innocent and shed the blood of the just; thou art guided by instinct only; another (Luther is meant) shall come and lead thee whither thou wouldst not go—the apostle of the living word and of justification by faith." Sinking indeed is the Papal system in France when it has not power to keep words like these out of the highest and most influential of its current literary organs.

THEODORE PARKER.

"SWEEP all the miracles away,
 And there is more of glory left
 Than beams on summer's brightest day,
 Of mists, of clouds bereft.

"Sweep all the miracles away;
 His word, his work, his high intent,
 Are sacred more, more blest than they,
 More true, more eloquent!

"Sweep all the miracles away,
 And then sublime the Saviour stands,
 A solid pile midst wrecks of clay,
 A house not made with hands."

'Tis a grand picture,—when I read
 The records and the musings o'er,
 All that he sees I see indeed,
 All, all, but something more.

That *something more* invites me now,
 From heaven's high arch I track it down,
 It lights upon the Saviour's brow,
 A wreath, a glorious crown.

Its rays grow heavenlier as I gaze,
 Fairer and farther still they shine;
 I know not *how* divine those rays,
 I feel they *are* divine.

J. B.

THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS, BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.*

SIR JOHN BOWRING is employing the evening of a more than usually active and useful life in recording some of his experiences in the East, and giving an enduring form to some of the varied stores of geographical and other knowledge which he has had the opportunity of gathering.

Few men possess natural gifts equal to his in respect to the facility of acquiring languages, and few have gone through a better preparatory training for making good use of foreign experiences. First as a merchant, he became familiar with the commercial resources and usages of all the principal European states. It was a fortunate circumstance for his country that before he had reached middle life he became the confidential associate of the celebrated Jeremy Bentham, and drank in from the teachings of that great political philosopher the first principles of legislation and government. When he came to apply the economical principles which he had learnt, he saw how grievously international trade was hampered and national wealth squandered by commercial restrictions. He thus became one of the early pioneers of that movement which resulted in the triumph, under Sir Robert Peel's Government, of the principles of Free Trade. If the prospect which has just opened upon the world of the adoption of the principle by our great neighbour in France, shall be fully realized, the result may be alike enduring and beneficial to the two countries and to all the world.

It was, we believe, in 1828 that Sir John (then Mr.) Bowring commenced his public services by undertaking, at the request of Mr. Herries, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, a mission to Holland to report on the public accounts of that country. For this office he was recommended by Mr. A. Baring (Lord Ashburton) and the Parliamentary Finance Committee. In 1832, he was nominated Secretary to the Commission for the Reform of the Public Accounts. He familiarized himself with the details of the public accounts of France, and his reports on the whole subject were presented to Parliament. Conjointly with Sir Henry Parnell, he prepared the reports and resolutions respecting the Exchequer which ultimately became the law of public accountancy in Great Britain and our colonies. In 1831, he received the appointment of Commercial Commissioner to France, being on this occasion united with Lord Clarendon. The result was certain modifications of the tariff, the first of a series of concessions which have had the effect of twice quadrupling our exports to France, and of quintupling the exports from that country to England. Recent events seem destined to give new and unex-

* A Visit to the Philippine Islands. By Sir John Bowring, LL.D., F.R.S., late Governor of Hong Kong, H.B.M.'s Plenipotentiary in China. 8vo. Pp. 434. London—Smith, Elder and Co., Cornhill.

pected value to the two elaborate reports presented by the Commissioners to Parliament on our commercial relations with France. It would be carrying us beyond our present purpose were we to mention in detail the public commercial missions undertaken by Sir John Bowring, the results of which are in the possession of Parliament. It is sufficient to say that they relate to Belgium, Egypt, Syria, Lombardy, Tuscany, Rome and Switzerland. In 1838, he represented his country at Berlin, at the meeting of the Zollverein. Of all the reports in which Sir John has had a hand, none has proved more fruitful in legislative and commercial results than that on Import Duties presented by Mr. Hume's Committee. It has been translated into all the commercial languages of Europe. Many of its recommendations, it is well known, were adopted by Sir Robert Peel.

It was in 1849 that Sir John was sent out to Canton as consul; in 1853 he became superintendent of trade and plenipotentiary to China; in 1854 he became governor of Hong Kong and chief superintendent of trade. It was in the year following that he negotiated the treaty with Siam. Of his account of his visit to that interesting country, our pages have given a brief review. The trade created by that treaty is already of vast amount. Where six ships a-year were engaged at Bangkok, now nearly two hundred yearly resort. Of the extraordinary difficulties which arose in China during his government, we need not speak. Freely as his public conduct in the East has been made the sport of party warfare, the general results sufficiently prove him to have been a sagacious and not unsuccessful representative and guardian of the interests of Great Britain under circumstances of peculiar peril. The trade with China rapidly grew under his government. Of that trade, bullion and opium represent in money value a greater amount than all other exports and imports together. But independently of these two principal items, the import trade of China rose in the five years of his government from about 5½ million dollars to upwards of 32 million dollars. At Hong Kong, free trade in the same period doubled the annual income and diminished the annual average Parliamentary grant from £16,340 to £880.

When a public officer is able to adduce services and results like these, he may safely leave his reputation in the hands of his countrymen.

The literary habits of Sir John Bowring, coupled with his indefatigable energy, enable him to render not unimportant collateral services to his country, by recording in volumes attractive to all classes of intelligent readers what he has seen and heard in his novel Eastern voyages and travels.

The visit to the Philippine Islands, of which one result is the publication of this handsome and interesting volume, took place in the latter part of 1858, when "illness and the despotism of

the doctors" compelled Sir John Bowring, by a few weeks' voyage and absence from the heavy cares of colonial government, to seek a renovation of health. He wisely directed his course to the Eastern Spanish Archipelago and its group of islands, of which hitherto European knowledge has been small and unsatisfactory. These islands are situated in the Eastern Sea, and lie between the 5th and the 20th degree of north latitude. The voyage from Hong Kong to Manila, the capital of the island of Luzon, was made in the Queen's ship *Magicienne* (Capt. Vansittart), and was accomplished, despite of the tempestuous sea and its wild cross waves, in five days. Manila, the capital of the Philippine Islands, is situated on the left bank of the river Pasig. One of the first objects to attract the attention of the traveller approaching the capital by its "silent highway," is a rude column of stone, crowned with a bronze armillary sphere, decorated with dolphins and anchors, on a marble base. This is the memorial of the illustrious Magellanes, the founder of Spanish authority in these islands. The city has seventeen spacious streets, crossing each other at right angles. The Plaza, in the fortress, with the cathedral on one side and the palace on another, is a handsome square, "its centre adorned by the glorious vegetation of the tropics, whose leaves present all varieties of colour, from the brightest yellow to the deepest green, and whose flowers are remarkable for their splendour and beauty." The climate is not undesirable, the average temperature being 81° 97' Fahrenheit. Europeans complain of the habitual dulness of the place; no skiffs diversify the river, no yachts add to the natural beauty of the bay; the sands are never enlivened by the animating horse-race, the beautiful drives are neglected. The climate may have something to do with this tendency to inaction in pleasure, the gravity of the Spanish character still more. There is a set-off against the great natural advantages of Manila and these islands in the liability to earthquakes. This has given its character to the domestic architecture that prevails, in which the light bamboo is found in the scaffolding, floors and principal wood-work, while the palm makes the walls and covers the roof. The same danger has given to the night-dresses of both sexes a more elaborate character than is found in temperate zones, that the sleeper may on the instant of alarm be prepared to fly from impending destruction.

Our author missed in this pleasant city the graceful Spanish costume, here as elsewhere Paris giving the accepted law as to dress; but he found some traces of the habits of old Spain, which he well describes:

"Among Europeans the habits of European life are slightly modified by the climate; but it appeared to me among the Spaniards there were more of the characteristics of old Spain than would now be found in the Peninsula itself. In my youth I often heard it said—and it was said with truth—that neither Don Quixote nor Gil Blas were pictures of the

past alone, but that they were faithful portraits of the Spain which I saw around me. Spain had then assuredly not been Europeanized; but fifty years—fifty years of increased and increasing intercourse with the rest of the world—have blotted out the ancient nationality, and European modes, usages and opinions, have pervaded and permeated all the upper and middling classes of Spanish society—nay, have descended deep and spread far among the people, except those of the remote and rural districts. There is little now to distinguish the aristocratical and high-bred Spaniard from his equals in other lands. In the somewhat lower grades, however, and among the whole body of clergy, the impress of the past is preserved with little change. Strangers of foreign nations, principally English and Americans, have brought with them conveniences and luxuries which have been to some extent adopted by the opulent Spaniards of Manila; and the honourable, hospitable and liberal spirit which is found among the great merchants of the East, has given them ‘name and fame’ among Spanish colonists and native cultivators. Generally speaking, I found a kind and generous urbanity prevailing,—friendly intercourse where that intercourse had been sought,—the lines of demarcation and separation between ranks and classes less marked and impassable than in most Oriental countries. I have seen at the same table Spaniard, mestizo and Indian—priest, civilian and soldier. No doubt a common religion forms a common bond; but to him who has observed the alienations and repulsions of *caste* in many parts of the Eastern world—caste, the great social curse—the blending and free intercourse of man with man in the Philippines is a contrast well worth admiring. M. Mallat’s enthusiasm is unbounded in speaking of Manila. ‘Enchanting city!’ he exclaims; ‘in thee are goodness, cordiality, a sweet, open, noble hospitality,—the generosity which makes our neighbour’s house our own;—in thee the difference of fortune and hierarchy disappears. Unknown to thee is etiquette. O Manila! a warm heart can never forget thy inhabitants, whose memory will be eternal for those who have known them.’—Pp. 17—19.

The statistics of Manila tell us of 11 churches, 3 convents, 363 private houses, and 88 public and other buildings. Of the population of 8618 souls, the Spaniards, native and European, are less than a fourth; there are 532 Chinese; the rest are Indians and Mestizos.

Of the calamities to which these islanders are specially subject, our author gives some striking particulars:

“Like other tropical climates, the Philippines are visited by the usual calamities gathered by the wild elements round that line which is deemed the girdle of the world. Violent hurricanes produce fearful devastations; typhoons cover the coasts with wrecks; inundations of rivers and excessive rains destroy the earth’s produce, while long-continued droughts are equally fatal to the labours and the hopes of husbandry. Earthquakes shake the land, overturn the strongest edifices and sport destructively with the power of man; volcanic mountains inundate the earth with their torrents of burning lava. Clouds of locusts sometimes devour all that is green upon the surface of the ground; and epidemic diseases carry away multitudes of the human race. The ravages caused by accidental fires are often most calamitous, as the greater part

of the houses are constructed of inflammable materials. When such a disaster occurs, it spreads with wonderful rapidity, and, there being no adequate means of extinction, a whole population is often rendered houseless."—Pp. 74, 75.

"The destructive ravages and changes produced by earthquakes are nowhere more remarkable than in the Philippines. They have overturned mountains, they have filled up valleys, they have desolated extensive plains; they have opened passages for the sea into the interior, and from the lakes into the sea. There are many traditional stories of these territorial revolutions, but of late disasters the records are trustworthy. That of 1796 was sadly calamitous. In 1824 many churches in Manila were destroyed, together with the principal bridge, the barracks, great numbers of private houses; and a chasm opened of nearly four miles in length. The inhabitants all fled into the fields, and the six vessels in the port were wrecked. The number of victims was never ascertained. In 1828, during another earthquake, the vibration of the lamps was found to describe an arch of four and a half feet; the huge corner-stones of the principal gate of the city were displaced; the great bells were set ringing. It lasted between two and three minutes, rent the walls of several churches and other buildings, but was not accompanied by subterranean noises, as is usually the case."—Pp. 81, 82.

"Earthquakes have produced great changes in the geography of the Philippines. In that of 1627, one of the most elevated of the mountains of Cagayan disappeared. In 1675, in the island of Mindanao, a passage was opened to the sea, and a vast plain was emerged. Successive earthquakes have brought upon Luzon a series of calamities."—P. 82.

Sir John Bowring closes his chapter on the geography and climate of the Philippine Islands with this beautiful passage:

"One cannot but be struck, in reference to the geographical character of these islands, with the awful serenity and magnificent beauty of their primeval forests, so seldom penetrated, and in their recesses hitherto inaccessible to the foot of man. There is nothing to disturb their silence but the hum of insects, the song of birds, the noises of wild animals, the rustling of the leaves, or the fall of decayed branches. It seems as if vegetation revelled in undisturbed and uncontrolled luxuriance. Creeping plants wander from tree to tree; lovely orchids hang themselves from trunks and boughs. One asks, why is so much sweetness, so much glory, wasted? But is it wasted? To the Creator the contemplation of his works, even where unmarked by human eye, must be complacent; and these half-concealed, half-developed treasures, are but reserved store-houses for man to explore; they will furnish supplies to awaken the curiosity and gratify the inquiry of successive ages. Rove where he may—explore as he will—tax his intellect with research, his imagination with inventions—there is, there will be, an infinite field around and above him, inexhaustible through countless generations."—Pp. 85, 86.

A few extracts must be selected expository of the religious ideas of the Philippine Indians:

"Many of the padres complain that, notwithstanding all the religious instruction given, the taint of idolatry still exists among the converted Indians. There is a sort of worship of ancestors which is seen in many forms. They attach to the word *nono* (forefather) the same spiritual

meaning which the Chinese give to *Kwei*. These nonos are often addressed in prayer, in order to bring down blessings or to avert calamities. If an Indian gather a flower or fruit, he silently asks leave of the nono. Certain spots, woods and rivers, he never passes without an invocation to these departed genii. Pardon is asked for short-comings or actions of doubtful character. There is a disease called *pamoo* which is attributed to the influence of the nonos, to whom petitions and sacrifices are offered to obtain relief. These idolatries, says one of the friars, are so deeply rooted and so widely spread as to demand the utmost vigilance for their extirpation.

"So, again, they have their native devil, in the shape of a little black old man, a wild horse, or monster. As a protection against this fiend, however, they apply to their rosary, which certainly affords evidence that *he* is an orthodox demon of whom the padres cannot fairly complain."—P. 156.

"The ancient Indian name for God was *Bathala*, to whom they attributed the creation of the world. Remnants of the old idolatry remain among the people, and the names of some of the idols are preserved." P. 157.

They have a god of eating, a god of the harvest, another deity who cures diseases; fishermen and hunters have each their tutelary deity.

"Though they have a pantheon of gods and goddesses (for most of their divinities have wives), they have no temples, and no rites of public worship. They consult soothsayers (usually old women) in their diseases and difficulties; and there are sacrifices, outpouring and mingling of blood, libations of fermented liquors, violent gesticulations, and invocations to *Cambunian* (God), the moon, and the stars, and the ceremonies end with eating and drinking to excess. They sacrifice a pig to pacify the Deity when it thunders, and adore the rainbow after the storm. Before a journey they kindle a fire, and if the smoke do not blow in the direction they intend to take they delay their project. The flight of birds is watched as an important augury, and the appearance of a snake as a warning against some approaching calamity."—P. 172.

The ecclesiastical authority of these islands is vested in one archbishop and three bishops. Among the Filipinos, as among other Catholic people, religious processions prevail and are highly popular.

"The most brilliant are those which take place after sunset, when some thousands of persons carry lighted wax candles, and the procession is sometimes a mile long, composed of all the military and civil authorities and of the ecclesiastical functionaries, vying with each other in the display of their zeal and devotion. On these occasions splendidly dressed images of the various objects of veneration form an important part of the ceremonial. I was assured that the jewels worn by the image of *Nuestra Senora de la Imaculada Concepcion* on the day of her festival exceeded 25,000 dollars in value. Numerous bands of music accompany the show. One of the most interesting parts of the exhibition is the number of little girls prettily and fancifully dressed in white, who follow some of the images of the saints or the *palo* of the arch-

bishop. One of the processions witnessed was forty minutes in passing, and of immense length, the whole way being lined with bearers of wax lights on both sides. There seems a rivalry among the religious orders as to whose displays shall be the most effective and imposing. The images are of the size of life, and clad in gorgeous garments encumbered with ornaments. They are borne on the shoulders of their votaries, occupying a platform, whence they are visible to the crowd."—Pp. 202, 203.

Many individuals and ecclesiastical communities enjoy great wealth. Some of the monks have their eight or nine thousand dollars per annum. Their accumulations pass at their death to their convents. The clergy give the Indians little trouble provided they attend mass with regularity and pay liberally the accustomed fees. Of the character of the clergy Sir John writes with moderation and candour :

"The personal courtesies, the kind reception and multifarious attentions which I received from the friars in every part of the Philippines naturally dispose me to look upon them with a friendly eye. I found among them men worthy of being loved and honoured, some of considerable intellectual vigour; but literary cultivation and scientific acquirements are rare. Occupied with their own concerns, they are little acquainted with mundane affairs. Politics, geography, history, have no charms for those who, even had they the disposition for study, would, in their seclusion and remoteness, have access to few of its appliances. Their convents are almost palatial, with extensive courts, grounds and gardens; their revenues frequently enormous. Though their mode of life is generally unostentatious and simple, many of them keep handsome carriages and have the best horses in the locality; and they are surrounded generally by a prostrate and superstitious population, upon whose hopes and fears, thoughts and feelings, they exercise an influence which would seem magical were it not by their devotees deemed divine. This influence, no doubt, is greatly due to the heroism, labours, sufferings and sacrifices of the early missionaries, and to the admirably organized hierarchy of the Roman Church, whose ramifications reach to the extremest points in which any of the forms or semblances of Christianity are to be discovered. Volumes upon volumes—the folio records of the proceedings of the different religious orders, little known to Protestant readers—fill the library shelves of these Catholic establishments, which are the receptacles of their religious history."—Pp. 209, 210.

The Philippine Islands are free from the curse of slavery; yet one class of labourers, the female weavers in the island of Iloilo, by improvidence lose the liberty of carrying their labour to the market they may find the best. A Lancashire weaver on her three or four looms would scorn the pittance of the Philippine weaver.

"All the weaving is done by women, whose wages usually amount to from 1 to 1.50 dollar per month. In general—a practice unfortunately too prevalent among the natives in every branch of labour—these wages are received for many months in advance, and the operatives frequently spend years (become, in fact, virtually slaves for a long period) before

paying off an originally trifling debt. There are other workwomen employed at intervals to 'set up' the pattern in the loom, who are able to earn from 1 to 1.50 dollar per day in this manner."—P. 397.

The report which our countryman gives of the public instruction of these islands is not hopeful, the provisions for it being little in advance of those that existed in the middle ages in Europe. There is at St. Thomas an university which has about 1000 students, and the studies range through grammar, metaphysics, the law, canon and civil, and theology. For the modern languages and science no provision is made. There are colleges and convents for women, but the instruction given is of a humble character. There is a naval school and an academy of arts.

We could gladly continue our extracts from this very interesting volume, but are warned by our decreasing space to hasten to a conclusion. The details of the products and commercial wants of these fertile islands and their prosperous inhabitants will be read with care, and we hope to their advantage, by our merchants. The impression made by Sir John Bowring's visit to three of the Philippine Islands evidently is that, unlike China, the country is under-peopled and affords boundless natural resources to the emigrant. Before closing the volume, we make one more extract, an eloquent passage, in which our countryman expresses the strength of his faith in the benignity and omnipotence of God's providence in regulating the proportion of food and other means of happiness to the human race :

"In the last generation a wonderful sensation was produced by the propagation of the great Malthusian discovery—the irresistible, indisputable, inexorable truth—that the productive powers of the soil were less and less able to compete with the consuming demands of the human race; that while population was increasing with the rapidity of a swift geometrical progression, the means of providing food lagged with the feebleness of a slow arithmetical advance more and more behind; that the seats at nature's table—rich and abundant though it was—were being abundantly filled, and that there was no room for superfluous and uninvited guests; in a word, to use the adopted formula, that population was pressing more and more upon subsistence, and that the results must be increasing want, augmenting misery, and a train of calamities boundless as the catalogue of the infinite forms of mortal wretchedness.

"How often, when threading through the thousand islands of the Philippine Archipelago, did the shadow of Malthus and the visions of his philosophy present themselves to my thoughts. Of those unnumbered, sea-surrounded regions, how many there are that have never been trodden by European foot, how few that have been thoroughly explored, and fewer still that are now inhabited by any civilized or foreign race! And yet they are covered with beautiful and spontaneous vegetable riches above, and bear countless treasures of mineral wealth below; their powers of production are boundless; they have the varieties of climate which mountains, valleys and plains afford—rains to water—suns to ripen—rivers to conduct—harbours for shipment—every recommendation to attract adventure and to reward industry; a population

of only five or six millions, when ten times that number might be supplied to satiety, and enable to provide for millions upon millions more out of the superfluities of their means.

“To what a narrow field of observation must the mind have been confined that felt alarm at a discovery, in itself of so little importance, when brought into the vast sphere of the world’s geography! Though the human race has been increasing at a rapid and almost immeasurable rate, it will be probably found that famines, and plagues, and wars, and those calamitous visitations which were deemed the redresses of the balance—the restorers of the due proportions between man’s wants and man’s supplies—were far more disastrous in ancient than in modern times, if the smaller number of then existing human beings be taken into consideration.

“The nobler and higher axiom is that ‘progress’ is the law of Providence, which never fails, while the race of man proceeds in ever-augmenting numbers, to provide ample means for their maintenance and happiness. Neither land nor sea is exhausted nor in process of exhaustion. What myriads of acres, whether in cold, temperate, or tropical climes, remain to be appropriated! what still greater amount to be improved by cultivation! And while in the more densely peopled parts of the world outlets may be required for those who are ill at ease and born to no inheritance but labour, how wonderfully are locomotive facilities increased, so that the embarrassment to ambulatory man is less to discover a fit place for his domicile, than to select one amid the many which offer themselves to his choice! If the poverty-struck Irish could emigrate in such multitudes to American or Australian regions, far greater are the facilities possessed by those better conditioned labouring masses of Europe who are still heavily pressed by the competition of neighbours more fortunate than themselves.

“It is a matter of surprise that the Spanish colonies should not have attracted a greater number of Spaniards to settle in them; but the national spirit of the Iberian peninsula has ceased to be ambulatory or adventurous. Spain itself is thinly peopled, and offers great resources to its satisfied peasantry. ‘God,’ they say, ‘has given everything to Spain which He had to give. Our land is an Eden—why should we desert it?’ Yet Spain, backward, inert and unenergetic, as she has proved herself to be in the rivalry of active nations, has taken her part in the proud history of human advancement. The more enterprising invaders of Gothic or Anglo-Saxon blood have frequently extirpated the indigenous races of the remote countries in which they have settled. One wave of emigration has followed another; commerce and cultivation have created a demand for, and provided a supply of, the intrusive visitors. But Spain has never furnished such numbers as to dislodge the aboriginal tribes. Her colonists have been always accompanied by large bodies of ecclesiastics, bent upon bringing ‘the heathen’ into the Christian fold. These missionaries have no doubt often stood between the cupidity of the conqueror and the weakness of the conquered. They have preserved, by protecting the Indian clans, and it may be doubted whether ultimately the permanent interests of man will not have been served by influences, whose beneficial consequences may remain when the most prominent evils connected with those influences may be greatly modified or wholly pass away.

“My observations and my reflections, then, lead to this conclusion—that, whatever exceptional cases there may be, the great tide of advancement rolls forward in ever-growing strength;—that the course of the Divine government is

From seeming evil still educing *good*,
And BETTER thence again, and BETTER still,
In infinite progression ;—

that the human family, taken as a whole, is constantly improving ;—that every generation is wiser and better than that which preceded it ;—that the savage and least improvable races will continue to be supplanted or absorbed by those of a higher intelligence ;—that the semi-civilized will only be perpetuated by contact with a greater civilization, which will raise them in the scale of humanity.”—Pp. 105—109.

MR. MARTINEAU IN ANSWER TO L.'S INQUIRY.

SIR,

YOUR correspondent L. (C. R. for January, p. 19) charges me with inconsistency in saying that I could not be a member of a Unitarian church, yet sharing the ministerial office in Little Portland-Street Chapel.

By a “Unitarian church” I meant, as the drift of my argument shews, a church whose constitution bound its members to a perpetuity of Unitarian doctrine, and excluded the possibility of spontaneous change.

Before accepting our present ministerial charge,—indeed, before receiving our final call to it,—Mr. Tayler and I addressed to the representatives of the congregation a letter which I presume your correspondent must have seen in print. It contains the following passage :

“It is unnecessary for us to state, that our religious views are those of Unitarian Christianity, and that we should not shrink, on suitable occasions, from asserting them in undisguised simplicity, and exhibiting them in the light best fitted to recommend them to the reason, conscience and affections of our fellow-men. But clearly as these views express our deep and mature conviction, the result of not a few years of study and reflection, we desire to hold them with the entire freedom which seems to us essential to their proper influence over the mind, rather than in conformity with the requirements of any written creed. Such doctrinal freedom we feel to be most consonant with a religious confidence in the power of simple truth, and most in accordance with the broad principle and catholic spirit of our Presbyterian forefathers. We do not know what may be the demands of your trust-deed, or how far a person becoming your minister would be bound thereby to use unaltered your form of public prayer. Our power of accepting with perfect satisfaction to our own minds any call which you might give us, must of course be

influenced by our knowledge of such restrictions, should they exist."

In answer to this statement of our feeling, renewed in the form of direct personal inquiry, we were assured, by the deputation which brought us the subsequent invitation from the Little Portland-Street society, that the constitution of the congregation was free from restrictive conditions and in harmony with our expressed wish.

For the purposes of this explanation I have used the word "church" in L.'s sense,—to denote a single congregation; but in the sentence criticised by him it was employed in its larger extent,—to denote an entire ecclesiastical denomination.

In your own note on L.'s communication, you have attributed to me, without a qualifying word, *strong dislike of the name Unitarian*; though you "think it just" to me to glean, for the better information of your correspondent, a scrap or two of evidence that I am "a believer in the doctrine of the Divine Unity." Allow me to recall your readers to the real issue, and your statement to its just dimensions, by quoting the following passage from my "Second Letter:"

"I hope it is apparent by this time that, in protesting against the ecclesiastical assumption of a dogmatic name, I am influenced by no depreciating estimate of doctrinal theology in general, or of Unitarian principles in particular. The question is not about the importance of this or that discriminative doctrine; but about the propriety of fixing *any* polemically-selected doctrine as the permanent essence of church-life. Were every characteristic of my own theology,—all that I most distinctly and positively hold,—picked out, endowed with some adequately expressive name, and put into the same position, my protest would lose nothing of its earnestness. *As for the word 'Unitarian,' it is a good one*, when you want to mark the particular side of theology to which it refers, and to speak of people by their theological classification. So long as the idea of a saving orthodoxy regulates the language of Christendom, and fixes curiosity more upon the creed than upon the life of men, the world will perhaps describe us by this name or by that of 'Socinian.' But it belongs to our ecclesiastical protest against the whole notion of orthodoxy, to accept neither; to insist on deposing the differences of creed from their monstrous usurpation; to draw forth into just prominence the spiritual and moral conditions in which alone our relation to God is realized; and in the name of Christ to proclaim a church of goodness, love, and heavenly-mindedness."

London, Jan. 18, 1860.

JAMES MARTINEAU.

POSTSCRIPT BY THE EDITOR OF THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

We regret to find that the Postscript which we appended to the letter of our correspondent L. has displeased Mr. Martineau. Knowing

as we did that that letter was written and sent to us before the writer of it had seen Mr. Martineau's Second Letter, we hoped to save the necessity of a reply by giving some of the evidence for which L. anxiously asked. When Mr. Martineau states that we have attributed to him, "without a qualifying word, *strong dislike of the name Unitarian*," he is not quite accurate. As there is the qualifying word, of the absence of which Mr. Martineau complains, we suppose that in penning his criticism he had not the *Christian Reformer* before him, and so unintentionally misrepresented us. Our words, which he does not quote, were (p. 20), "We think it just to Mr. Martineau to quote one or two passages which intimate that he is a believer in the doctrine of the Divine Unity, however strongly he dislikes the name 'Unitarian,' and whatever may be his estimate of Unitarian literature, plans of organization," &c. &c. We then selected as many passages as suited our available space on the page and seemed to answer the questions put by L. We are well pleased that to these passages the addition of another is made by its author.

But perhaps the most important part of Mr. Martineau's present communication is the passage given from the joint letter of himself and Mr. Tayler to the Portland-Street congregation. We suppose we are right in regarding it as the expression of Mr. Martineau's present theological convictions; and although we cannot reconcile the statement with some passages in his first Letter, and still less put it into harmony with the ungenial and antagonistic spirit which pervaded it, we are pleased to receive an explicit statement like this, which will dissipate much misunderstanding among Unitarians and others. The painful part of the case is, that it is impossible for this last letter of Mr. Martineau to enjoy the wide circulation given to the first Letter, and for years probably we shall have the sharp and *apparently* anti-Unitarian passages of the latter thrown in our teeth by theological opponents. Already this use has been made of it by Mr. Rowland Williams on the one side and by Mr. Holyoake on the other.

Here we are content to let the "Position" controversy drop. A strong conviction of the inexpediency of its continuance restrained us in our notice of the Second Letter. The same motive induces us to take only a passing notice of the speech lately delivered by Mr. Martineau at Liverpool, in which he gives an account, more clever than dignified and more amusing than fair, of the objections of his critics. We content ourselves with the remark that we do not accept his statement of the argument between himself and us as accurate. With this reference to the controversial portion of the Liverpool speech, we let it pass, wishing only to retain in our memory the beautiful thoughts and golden truths which, mixed with some alloy, abound in it.

DEFERENCE TO CUSTOM.

HE who does anything because it is the custom, makes no choice. He gains no practice either in discerning or in desiring what is best.
Mill on Liberty.

INTELLIGENCE.

MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

The annual meeting of the Trustees, the seventy-fourth, was held in the chapel-rooms, Cross Street, Manchester, on Thursday, the 19th of January. There was a numerous attendance of Trustees, occasioned in great part by a statement which had crept into the newspapers, to the effect that there existed an intention to attack the position of Mr. Martineau as one of the Professors, on the ground of dissatisfaction with his theological views. Although this unfounded rumour received immediate and official contradiction, it was injudiciously renewed in an article, in other respects not commendable, by the editor of the *Inquirer*, in the publication immediately preceding the day of meeting. There were between sixty and seventy Trustees present from London, Leeds, Lancaster, Bolton, Sheffield, as well as Manchester and the immediate vicinity.

Neither President nor Vice-President being in attendance at the commencement of the proceedings, Rev. W. GASKELL was called to the chair, and remarked that he believed the College was never in a more prosperous condition financially than at present, or, if its friends would agree to unite their differences, in a better position to fulfil satisfactorily the objects for which it was founded. Having read a letter from Mr. W. R. Wood, explaining the reasons of his absence from the meeting, he called on Mr. R. D. Darbishire, one of the Secretaries, to read the minutes of the proceedings of the Committee for the past year.

This having been done, Mr. J. C. LAWRENCE, in moving that the minutes be confirmed, took occasion to advert to two points; one, which he had already brought before the notice of the Trustees at meetings in London, was the promotion among their students of the habit of expressing themselves in public without the use of notes. He was afraid that in this respect Manchester New College students compared unfavourably with those of other denominations; and believing that their Professors were quite prepared to follow out any suggestions of the Committee, with whom he thought the initiative should lie, he begged to inquire whether any steps were being taken to ensure greater attention to this matter. The other point referred to the subjects of study. He believed that Political Economy had been mentioned as part of the Philosophical course, and feeling strongly the importance of this subject,

begged to inquire whether its introduction into the curriculum was being provided for by the Committee.

Rev. C. BEARD explained that, although Political Economy had been originally mentioned as part of Mr. Martineau's course, complaints had been so frequently made of the subjects of study being already too numerous and the students' attention too severely taxed, that the Committee had not been able to see their way clearly to a further increase of work.

The CHAIRMAN, with respect to the subject of extempore speaking, explained that the Principal had by no means lost sight of it, but took much pains himself to practise the students in ready utterance, and was pursuing a plan which had been recommended to him by Mr. Macready, whom he had consulted.

Mr. GEORGE WADSWORTH, judging from the utterance of a recent student of the College, the newly-elected minister of Cross Street, was led to infer that the faculty of ready address had been very successfully attended to.

The resolution for confirming the minutes, having been seconded by Mr. S. D. DARBISHIRE, was then put and carried unanimously.

The next business was the reading of the Treasurer's report, from which it appeared that the excess of receipts over expenditure, after transferring £200 to the Permanent Fund, amounted to about £90, of which, however, £50 will be absorbed by a necessary increase of shelving in the Library. The subscriptions actually collected amounted to £1166; benefactions, including £100 each from the Principal (for Hebrew instruction) and the late President, Mr. J. P. Heywood, to £265; congregational collections, including £75 from Brook Street, Manchester, and £58 from Renshaw Street, Liverpool, to £208; rents of buildings, £547, and farms, £243; interest, £265; total receipts, £2695; while the total disbursements, including £200 transferred to Permanent Fund, amounted to £2604. The capital stock of the Institution, including a balance in hand of £786, was estimated at £19,697.

The Treasurer's report having been passed, the Secretary, Mr. R. D. Darbishire, read the address of the Committee:

"The Committee of Manchester New College, in presenting their annual report to the Trustees, desire, in the first place, to state, in explanation of the accounts, that they have received from congregational

collections during the past year the sum of £208. 11s., a large part of which was acknowledged in the last annual address. They have also received in benefactions the sum of £265. 1s., including a gift from the President of £100, and another of like amount from the Principal.

"The subscriptions discontinued and unpaid during the year amount to about £30, and the same sum has been added in new or increased ones. The list of 1859, as compared with that of 1858, shews a deficiency of about £40, which arises from the deaths of several old and liberal friends.

"Of the balance of £290 exhibited by the accounts to the credit of the Institution, £200 has been transferred to Permanent Fund, and a portion of the remainder will be devoted to the purchase of additional bookcases for the library.

"The Committee regret to state that they have received from Mr. R. N. Philips his resignation of the Treasurership of the College, an office which he had held since the year 1854. They think it due to the energy and efficiency with which Mr. Philips has performed his duties, to repeat in this place the thanks which they have already offered to him by resolution.

"During the past year, the Committee have had to deplore the loss by death of the Rev. James Whitehead, a Trustee since 1839; of the Rev. Charles Wallace, M.A., a Trustee since 1821, and formerly a student of Manchester College, York; and of the Rev. William Harrison, a Trustee since 1806. The death of Mr. John Ashton Nicholls, F.R.A.S., of Manchester, a gentleman whose philanthropic enterprise and public usefulness had already earned for him the respect of all his fellow-citizens, is a subject of peculiar regret to those who would willingly attribute to the influences that affected him while a lay student in Manchester New College, somewhat of the enlightened and self-sacrificing energy that characterized him.

"The decease of the Rev. William Turner, a Trustee since 1805, a subscriber since 1807, and Visitor of the College for more than 50 years, demands an especial mention in this place. The Committee have already expressed their deep sense of Mr. Turner's long and efficient services to the College, in a resolution which they placed upon their minutes and transmitted to his surviving relatives. But they cannot allow the present occasion to pass without again putting on record their respectful admiration of Mr. Turner's honourable and blameless life, of the devotion of his energies, during more than man's ordinary term of efficiency, to none but useful and benevolent objects, and of the wise counsels

which he gave to so many generations of departing students.

"During the session of 1858-59, the number of divinity students on the foundation was sixteen, viz., sixth year, Messrs. C. B. Upton, B.A., James Drummond, B.A., and John Lloyd; fifth year, Messrs. Joseph Dare, B.A., Percy Bakewell, B.A., George Heaviside, B.A., and R. W. Simpson, B.A.; fourth year, Mr. Frederick Mitchell; third year, Messrs. E. S. Howse, B.A., James Pillars, J. D. H. Smyth, and H. E. Dowson; second year, Mr. W. J. Smyth; first year, Mr. T. H. Smith. Besides these, Mr. Wm. Matthews, sixth year, and Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., fourth year, were admitted free to lectures; Mr. Matthews also receiving a special grant of £25 for the year.

"With the approval of the Committee, Mr. Joseph Dare was permitted to hold a scholarship granted by the Fishmongers' Company of London, for the purpose of enabling him to attend additional courses at University College. Mr. Upton, Mr. Drummond, Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Matthews, have completed their academical studies. Mr. Drummond has accepted an invitation to become the colleague of the Rev. Wm. Gaskell in the ministry at Cross-Street chapel, Manchester. Mr. Lloyd has succeeded the late Rev. John Smethurst at Moreton Hampstead; and Mr. Matthews, the Rev. J. K. Montgomery at Huddersfield. Mr. Upton is pursuing his studies as a Hibbert scholar. Mr. T. Holland, who left the College in June, 1858, has become the minister of the congregation at Bridgewater. Besides the regular students of the College, a few gentlemen, not otherwise connected with it, have attended some of Professor Martineau's courses.

"The Committee have taken some pains, by a more extended advertisement than had obtained in former years, to bring the College courses before the public notice, and hope, by degrees, to induce others than those who design to make the ministry their business in life, to avail themselves of the opportunities offered by lectures on such subjects as Christian Truths and Evidences, Ecclesiastical History, or Scriptural Criticism, in the hands of the Rev. John James Tayler, or by the Philosophical Courses of Rev. James Martineau, or the History of Christian Doctrines of the same Professor.

"The annual examination was held in University Hall on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday, June the 20th, 21st and 22nd. At the close of the proceedings the usual address to the students was delivered by the Rev. John Kenrick, M.A., Visitor.

"The Committee make the following

extract from the careful report of the examination presented by the Visitors, Mr. Kenrick and Mr. Gaskell :

“ ‘In last year’s report attention was drawn to the importance of the exercise afforded in grammatical analysis by readings in Greek and Latin with the Professors, and to the need there was for it. We are happy to be able to state that in this part of the examination a marked improvement was observable on that of the preceding year.

“ ‘The answering of the students in Mathematics shewed that they had made fair use of the advantages provided for them in University College and Mr. Bridge’s private instruction.

“ ‘With reference to the classes of the Principal, the answers in all of them were excellent, with the exception of those of the junior Ecclesiastical History, which seemed to us scarcely so good as we have known them in previous years. We may single out for special praise the class on New-Testament Greek, to which great care had evidently been given.

“ ‘In Mr. Martineau’s department, the answers of the class in Mental Philosophy, which have generally been of great merit, struck us as somewhat below the average of former examinations; but those of the other classes were good throughout; and some of the papers read, particularly those of Mr. Drummond, were remarkably full and accurate.

“ ‘In the classes on Hebrew, the reading shewed that the students were profiting by the accurate knowledge of their teacher. The questions on the introductions to the several books studied were answered in a satisfactory manner.

“ ‘The sermons read in the Common Hall were good in tone and spirit, and the manner in which they were delivered was such as to draw forth the approval of some of the Trustees, who in this respect had found reason for complaint on previous occasions.’

“ ‘In the examinations of the London University, Mr. Edwin Smith has obtained the degree of M.A. in Mental and Moral Philosophy; and Mr. T. H. Smith and Mr. W. J. Smyth have matriculated during the past year.

“ ‘Mr. Dare and Mr. Coupland have been elected Hibbert scholars, and Mr. E. Smith has received from the same foundation an increased exhibition, with the title of Hibbert Fellow. Mr. Smith is pursuing his studies at a German University.

“ ‘In the classes of University College, the following distinctions were gained by students of Manchester New College: Mr. E. S. Howse (third year), senior Latin,

third certificate; Mr. H. E. Dowson (second year), senior Latin, fourth certificate; Mr. T. H. Smith (first year), junior Latin, second prize and second certificate; Mr. E. S. Howse, senior Greek, sixth certificate; Mr. H. E. Dowson, senior Greek, ninth certificate; Natural Philosophy (junior Mathematical section), Mr. H. E. Dowson, third prize and third certificate; Mr. T. H. Smith, lower junior Mathematics, first prize and first certificate; Mr. Joseph Dare (fifth year), English essay (subject, “The Inductive Method of Bacon”), prize.

“ ‘The session of 1859-60 opened with the following divinity students, namely, Mr. W. C. Coupland, B.A., free to lectures; and, on the foundation, Messrs. Joseph Dare, B.A., George Heaviside, B.A., Percy Bakewell, B.A., R. W. Simpson, B.A., F. Mitchell, Edward S. Howse, B.A., J. D. H. Smyth, B.A., James Pillars, W. J. Smyth, T. H. Smith. Of these, Mr. Pillars has received permission to suspend his studies for the present session on account of serious ill health; and Mr. H. E. Dowson, who entered the College in his second year, has been allowed to repeat his third year’s courses. The new students of the year are, Messrs. Alexander Gordon, B.A., J. E. Odgers, Richard Pilcher and John Smith.

“ ‘The Committee cannot close their address without again calling the attention of the Trustees, and, if haply they may reach them, others who share with the more accustomed friends of Manchester New College some lively interest in the religious progress of the age, to the peculiar advantages of this College as a school, above all others in the country, fitted for the training of ministers qualified to take a prominent place amongst the faithful apostles of the church of God.

“ ‘At a time when on every hand earnest men are shewing themselves ready to hail with joy every word of life that reaches their ears, it would seem especially incumbent on those who have already attained a conviction of the value of the fundamental truths and influences of the religion of Christ, under whatever forms it may be held by devout men free from the restraints of sect, to stand forth and prove themselves, in the living simplicity of their own faith, honest and self-denying missionaries of God’s truth.

“ ‘The Committee do but echo the sense of all thoughtful students of the times, when they refer to the increasing body of persons who are prepared to recognize in unflinching exercise of the powers of thought, aided by the resources of the many-sided science of the day, the soundest

means of clearing away superstitious fetters of priestcraft and church authority, and so leaving clear scope for a more intelligent development of genuine spiritual life than the world has yet seen.

"It is not overstating the case to say, that since the Reformation there has not been in England, in Germany or in France, any period when the right of the individual conscience in matters of religion has been at once so fervently asserted, and so widely allowed, or so fiercely assailed as now; nor was there ever, either in this country or in America, a time when free and faithful preachers of the word might so surely rely upon securing attentive hearing and serious consideration.

"As Trustees for the spiritual culture of one portion—how large a portion it is not for them to say—of the coming generation, the managers of Manchester New College would strenuously exhort all who have opportunity, to encourage young men of promise in applying themselves with Christian self-devotion to the work of the ministry, and after preparing themselves for a season with hearty loving faith and cultivated intelligence, in looking forward with joy to lives of disinterested self-abandonment in the great cause,—dwelling themselves, and so best teaching others to dwell, with Christ in God."

Rev. T. E. POYNTING, in moving the adoption and printing of the address, together with the Treasurer's report, said that we had now perhaps reached as complete a unity as was practically attainable. He had heard it said that the College did not represent the theology of our body. But the fact was that the diversities allowed among us were so great, that it was perhaps impossible to agree upon any common theology. The only thing therefore was for us to have men in our Professorial chairs who represent us in that love of truth and reverence for freedom which we all feel, and combine with these moral qualities great powers of mind, so as to command the respect of their students and inspire them with zeal in their work.

Rev. NOAH JONES seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Rev. JOHN ROBERTS, with a few appropriate remarks, moved, and Mr. ROBERT HEYWOOD seconded, a vote of thanks to the officers and Committee for their services.

On the motion of Rev. F. BAKER, seconded by Rev. J. ASHTON, Mr. Thomas Ainsworth, of Cleator, was unanimously chosen President, in the room of Mr. J. P. Heywood, who had retired.

The Vice-Presidents, Chairman of Committee and Secretaries, were re-elected.

In the Committee, the following gentlemen were the new appointments—Messrs. Cookson and Case, of London; Mr. Thos. Avison, of Liverpool; and Mr. Henry Turner, of Manchester.

Mr. R. N. Philips having retired from the office of Treasurer, which he had held for five years to the great advantage of the Institution, Mr. Thomas Ashton was unanimously chosen thereto, on the motion of Mr. H. COPPOCK, seconded by Rev. J. H. THOM.

The routine business having been concluded, the Chairman invited any Trustees present who might wish to bring other subjects before the meeting to do so; upon which,

Mr. W. SHARN, adverting to the difficulty felt by the London members of the Committee in attending to their duties, and the expenditure of time and money involved in a journey to Manchester, suggested that one Committee meeting at least during the year should be held in London, which might easily be done in June, at the time of the examination.

Mr. HODGSON PRATT had been desirous of moving a resolution of similar purport, though carrying the idea somewhat further. He thought there should be a London Secretary appointed, to give information to those who, not belonging to our denomination, might nevertheless wish to attend some of the lectures; and he urged a more extended system of advertising, that the existence of our College may be made known to the public of other denominations.

A conversation on the practicability of these suggestions took place, in which several other gentlemen took part, and these resolutions were adopted:

"That the Trustees request the Committee to consider the propriety of their arranging to meet once in the year at least in London, and if practicable to do so.

"That it be referred to the Committee to consider whether, for the purpose of rendering the lectures at the College more easily accessible to lay students and more generally known, it be not desirable that a Secretary be appointed in London, whose business it shall be to receive the fees and afford such information in relation to the College courses and other points as may be necessary, and that the London Secretary shall act under the instructions of the Secretaries in Manchester."

The business concluded with a vote of thanks to the Chairman.

The resignation of the Treasurership and of his seat on the Committee by Mr. R. N. Philips, lately M.P. for Bury, and previously High Sheriff of Lancashire, involves,

we fear, the separation from College affairs of that which we may term the great Dis-senting family of Philips. To the accumulated property of the College, that family has been in its various branches by far the largest contributor. From the day of the foundation of Manchester College, on the 22nd of February, 1786, to the meeting a few days ago, there has never been a time when one or more members of that family have not been active and prominent members of the College Committee, and taking a leading part in everything connected with the welfare and usefulness of the Institution. Indeed, in the late Mr. Robert Philips and his two sons there has been an uninterrupted succession of service on the Committee during the whole period of seventy-two years of the existence of Manchester College. The interest, so long and steadily maintained, has, we know, continued unabated to the last. Of the causes which have now led to the withdrawal of Mr. R. N. Philips from the position which he filled honourably alike to himself and to the religious body to which he belonged, we have no definite information. Whatever may have been the cause of Mr. Philips's retirement from office, the fact must be sincerely deplored by every one who desires the prosperity and usefulness of the College.

RECOGNITION SERVICE AT HUDDERSFIELD.

The recognition services in connection with the settlement of Rev. W. Matthews, late student of Manchester New College, London, as minister of Fitzwilliam-Street Church, Huddersfield, took place on Wednesday, December 28th, 1859.

Divine service commenced at eleven o'clock. After an introductory hymn, the Rev. John Owen, of Lydgate, read the appropriate lessons from Ezekiel xxxiii. and 2 Timothy ii., and offered the ordination prayer. Mr. William Hornblower, in behalf of the congregation, then briefly addressed the newly-elected minister in words which indicated a deep sense of the solemnity of the relation of a Christian minister to his people. Mr. Matthews's reply partook of the same spirit; and on the part of both, the mutual relation now recognized and confirmed was viewed in the light of a just and confiding liberty. The welcome of the West-Riding ministers to Mr. Matthews was then given by Rev. J. H. Ryland, of Bradford, who, after adverting to the issue of religious liberty in Christian truth, in the case of confessors and ministers in Yorkshire and the north, both of former and more recent times, and indicating some of the peculiar dangers to

the ministerial office incident to the present time, welcomed Mr. Matthews to the district as one who had passed through the ordeal of a change of view, was of the same *alma mater* with many whom he now joined, and would, they felt assured, prove a congenial and devoted fellow-labourer; while of all present it would be the fervent prayer that, as he entered into the labours of those who before him had faithfully and zealously laboured to build up both the inward and the outward church in Huddersfield, his labours and anxieties equally with theirs might be crowned with a permanent and abiding success. After a suitable hymn, the charge was given by Rev. J. J. Tayler, B.A., Principal of Manchester New College. His subject was "preaching Christ" as himself the revelation of the Father; preaching him also by the assiduous cultivation of his spirit of self-sacrificing devotion. After another hymn, the sermon was preached by the Rev. G. Vance Smith, B.A., of York, from Matt. vii. 28, 29. It took a most just and discriminating view of the reciprocal duties of minister and people at the present time; its considerate Christian counsel at once commending itself to the hearer. An anthem and hymn followed, after which Mr. Smith concluded the service with the usual prayer.

At the close of service, members of the congregation and friends assembled to dinner at the Imperial Hotel, W. P. England, Esq., Secretary of Committee, in the chair. The principal speakers after dinner were Rev. B. Herford, of Sheffield, and Revds. J. J. Tayler and G. V. Smith. Mr. Herford applied the sentiment of Civil and Religious Liberty to the immediate and pressing claims of Unitarian Christianity. Mr. Tayler pleaded for the inviolateness of daily hours of study on the part of the young minister. Mr. Smith returned thanks in acknowledgment of the health of the gentlemen who had taken part in the service, and in doing so made pleasing allusion to Rev. G. Heape Stanley, the first minister of the Huddersfield congregation, now of Sydney, Australia. Joseph Lupton, Esq., of Leeds, acknowledged the health of the visitors.

In the evening, there was a congregational tea-party in the school-rooms beneath the chapel, Mr. England again in the chair. The rooms were brightly decorated. Mr. Herford and Rev. G. Barmby, of Wakefield, were obliged to leave early in the afternoon, Mr. Owen and Rev. R. L. Carpenter, of Halifax, in the course of the evening; the latter, however, not before he had taken a part allotted to him. Mr. T. H. Smith, student of Manchester New

College, and Mr. Mark Glover, were present during the day, from Bradford. Mr. G. Buckton accompanied Mr. J. Lupton from Leeds. Mr. H. J. Morehouse was present also from Stony Bank, Lydgate. In the course of the afternoon and evening's proceedings, letters were read from Revds. J. Kenrick, of York, T. Hincks, of Leeds, J. Martineau, Dr. Beard, E. Kell, and Mr. James Robinson, of Clayton West, explaining causes of absence. Mr. Kell's letter alluded to the Huddersfield congregational history, and the great obligations of the society to its former ministers. Mr. Hincks had been suddenly called to Belfast by the death of a sister.

After tea, the speakers and sentiments were as follow :

Mr. WHITTAKER—"The necessity of Individual Effort to preserve Congregational Life."

Mr. HORNBLOWER—"May our Sunday-schools be a nursery for our Church, and our Church a foster-mother to our Sunday-schools !"

Rev. R. L. CARPENTER, Secretary to the West-Riding Missionary Society—"The Working-classes of our country; may they find shelter in our free churches, and response to their religious yearnings; and may God's continued blessing rest upon the West-Riding of Yorkshire!" Mr. Carpenter alluded to the zeal of his predecessor, Rev. J. K. Montgomery, in the office of Secretary, and gave a sketch of the success of the present missionary stations.

Rev. P. CANNON, of Wakefield, also gave an account of the formation of the Dewsbury Unitarian society.

Rev. J. J. TAYLER—"Catholicity of sentiment, and sympathy with the good and great of other churches, compatible with the manly avowal and zealous diffusion of Unitarian Christianity." Mr. Tayler's was a beautiful address, full of most true and just distinction.

Rev. G. VANCE SMITH—"Unitarian interpretations of Scripture not the errors of an uninformed minority, but the conclusions endorsed by the foremost theologians of the age." Mr. Smith took just exception to the word "*Unitarian* interpretations," pointing out that the only aim of an interpreter of scripture was to learn what scripture means, be it this or that. Mr. Smith also pointed out the special inconsistency of the party loudest for inspiration, loudest also for no change in an imperfect text and inadequate translation.

Mr. W. FROANE—"The old Pulpit in its new place, [it had been changed from one side of the chapel to the other]; may all the good wishes of our friends and visitors this day be abundantly realized in

the success and happiness of the Rev. W. Matthews in this his first sphere of ministerial labour!"

Rev. W. MATTHEWS responded, dwelling upon the liberty he experienced among Unitarians as compared with his former sphere of life, expressing his desire for numbers without their pale to join, and urging his new flock to congregational activity.

Rev. J. H. RYLAND, in speaking to the sentiment of "The Fathers of liberal Non-conformity and the influence of their examples," alluded not only to the dangers of fashion to open avowal, but also to the now common case of sentiment without conviction adding to the danger.

The usual acknowledgments concluded the evening, which had also been varied with music from the choir.

A NOBLE PHILANTHROPIC EFFORT IN BIRMINGHAM.

A friend has sent us a pamphlet which we have looked through with no little interest. It is entitled, "Report of Collections for the Benefit of the General Hospital, Birmingham, in the Churches and Chapels of the Town and Neighbourhood, made simultaneously on Sunday, Nov. 13, 1859; and of the Proceedings connected therewith." The General Hospital of Birmingham was established in 1766 by Dr. John Ash, an eminent physician, and opened in 1778 with 40 beds. It has grown with the wonderful growth of the town, and now contains 240 beds for indoor patients and has a separate out-patient department. In the year ending at Midsummer last, it gave relief to more than 19,000 patients. Since the erection of the Hospital, the number of patients admitted to its benefits amounts to nearly half a million! Its affairs are conducted with skill and economy. The cost of each in-patient averages £3. 9s. 10d.; that of each out-patient, 1s. 10d. The crowded state of the Hospital last year gave importance to the suggestion that another wing should be built; but before engaging in new and increased expenditure, it was necessary to remove a debt due to the Treasurers of £3500. Dr. Miller, the benevolent and respected rector of St. Martin's, appealed in a letter (published in the *Birmingham Journal*, and bearing date Oct. 13, 1859) to the generosity of his townsmen to clear off the debt, and suggested that a collection should be made from pew to pew in every place of worship in the town on some given Sunday. A conference of the ministers of religion was invited by circular before the end of the month, in order to take steps

for carrying Dr. Miller's suggestion into effect. We observe with pride that the name of our respected correspondent, Rev. SAMUEL BACHE, is the first signature attached to the circular. All classes of ministers of religion, Protestant and Catholic, Churchmen and Dissenters, joined the meeting; and as its result, the second Sunday in November was fixed upon as the day for the combined charitable movement of the religious public of Birmingham. On that day more than 140 collections were made in the churches and chapels of Birmingham and of some of the neighbouring towns, and the noble sum was raised of £5051. The members of the two Unitarian congregations did their duty on this occasion, and stand second and third in the list, the order being regulated by the amount of the contribution. The New Meeting-house sent £319. 3s., and the Old Meeting-house £203. 18s. 6d. The place of honour is given to Dr. Miller's church, St. Martin's, which contributed £407. 19s. 10d. Dr. Miller had anticipated that seven congregations would send each £100. In fact, ten sent upwards of £150, and fifteen sent more than £100 each.

A deputation of the ministers of religion reported to a special weekly Board of the Hospital the results of the appeal. Dr. Miller concluded his speech on the occasion by remarking "that the printed record of the movement which was being prepared would be a memorial of the fact, that in our day there was, in the hearts of the people of Birmingham, a well-spring of philanthropy and benevolence which was ready to well up if rightly appealed to, and that they acted according to the golden sentence dropped from the lips of one whom they had recently lost, 'As there is no sectarianism in misery, there should be no sectarianism in mercy.'"

A resolution of gratitude was tendered to the ministers of religion, which Mr. Bache acknowledged, "thanking the Committee for their efforts, and bore hearty testimony to the debt of gratitude they owed to Dr. Miller for the courtesy and urbanity with which he had presided at their meetings. It was probably unprecedented that 50 or 60 clergymen and ministers should have met on two occasions without utterance being given to a single word that any one would wish to have recalled. He hoped all would do their best that the divine blessing which had been bestowed on that movement might not be frittered away or lost, but that it would stimulate them in the cause of general benevolence, and in cherishing that spirit of mutual love which became those professing to be ministers of the God of love."

We may add that the Cradley Unitarian congregation contributed £12. 3s. 6d.; that of Dudley, £22. 12s. 4d.; that of Stourbridge, £23. 2s.; and the Newhall-Hill congregation (Birmingham), £16. 14s. 7d. And the "widow's mite" was contributed by the Domestic Mission. Well is it observed in relation to this movement of philanthropy so judiciously conceived and so nobly extended, "Never has an Ecclesiastical Council been composed of more varied elements, addressed itself to a more benevolent purpose, exercised in a more exemplary manner the spirit of mutual forbearance, brotherly kindness, and enlightened, earnest co-operation, or accomplished its object with an efficiency in which is more clearly discernible the evidence of that 'blessing from the God of mercy,' for which its several members were exhorted by their reverend brother, who suggested the movement, to 'look up.' May that Gracious Being confirm and strengthen this fraternal regard, and bring them together again into the same active and cordial union, whenever his Providence shall afford an occasion for combined benevolent exertion in the cause of suffering humanity!"

UNIVERSITY REFORM.

When Parliament meets, this subject, in one of its branches at least, will, it is hoped, receive its early attention. When the University Acts of 1854 and 1856 were passed, the improvement of College constitutions was left to Commissioners, appointed for Oxford in 1854, and for Cambridge in 1856. These Commissioners have either quietly ignored the existence of Dissenters, as in the case of the Oxford Commission of 1854, or, after suggesting the moderate compromise of students not members of the Church of England being allowed to absent themselves from Church-of-England services, they have (as in the case of the Cambridge Commission now sitting) yielded to College influence, and dropped their intended measure of conciliation, and left Dissenting students, absolutely under a College ecclesiastical board, to attend Church services. Mr. Pollard-Urquhart, M.P., will probably on an early day move the House that an Address be presented to the Crown, praying Her Majesty to withhold her consent from the statutes of the two great Colleges of Trinity and St. John's as sanctioned by the Commissioners, inasmuch as they do not respect the rights intended to be secured to Nonconformist members of the University. The Unitarian Association has issued a circular stating the facts of the case, and urging its friends

to petition Parliament and correspond with Members of the House of Commons, and to ask their support of Mr. Pollard-Urquhart's motion.

A NEW UNITARIAN PERIODICAL.

We take a passage or two from a little periodical which has just started into existence in the West, called *The Devonshire Watchman*:

"It has been judged desirable that the Dissenters of this county who carry their Protestantism to the fullest and most consistent extent should be better represented than they have for some years past been, and should render a more suitable contribution to the necessities of these remarkable times, and help forward somewhat more eminently the sacred cause of evangelical truth and righteousness. This little work, of which the first eight pages are published with the commencement of the year 1860, may constitute a closer bond of union than at present subsists among a few churches of Christ's disciples, that are inferior to none in real attachment to the Saviour and in sincere goodwill to the highest welfare of the human race. We think it may be made to appear that much misrepresentation covers those churches that are inferior to none in the true grounds of respectability, in researches to arrive at truth themselves, or in philanthropic wishes, whatever their actual services recently, to spread the pure gospel of Christ. In one remarkable respect the county of Devon is distinguished by the first struggle for what Sir Isaac Newton has called 'the long-lost truth.' We apprehend that the city of Exeter, whose secular motto is *Semper fidelis*, was the first among the cities of England to erect a church for the worship of the *Father*, the *only living and true God*, in the name of our blessed Saviour, in which the disciples of Christ might worship God according to the sacred command, independently of the favour of the world; aided by ministers who enjoyed the highest advantages of learning and science, to enable them to act as pioneers in the march of liberal religion and Christian knowledge. Such were Hallett and Peirce, at the very beginning of the eighteenth century, for whom a spacious chapel was erected by the opulent merchants of Exeter. The writer distinctly remembers on the entablature of that simple temple, near the ancient Mint, the date of 1719, and rejoices that Providence permits him, after a long period of ministerial service, to make one effort more for truth and Christ and God. May it be acceptable and useful! At a later period, as the century advanced,

we have to record the honoured names of Micaiah Towgood, Merivale, Bretland, Kenrick, Carpenter, Manning and Acton, men of great strength and mental acuteness, furnished with large stores of biblical wisdom, and animated with the spirit of zeal for farther and more complete reformation. We shall probably, if this humble effort be successful, sketch the leading characteristics of these holy men, of whom the world, agitated and torn by political factions, was scarcely worthy. We may, by this means, draw out for the benefit of our Devonshire fellow-countrymen some of that admiration to which these ministers of Christ were eminently entitled, but which too inadequately they have hitherto received."

EXTRACTS FROM THE TIMES ON THE PROPOSED REVISION OF THE LITURGY.

Lord Ebury's agitation for the revision of the Liturgy is producing some good results. In the *Times* of Jan. 4, he publishes an able letter of a clergyman, son of the late distinguished Bishop of Lincoln (Dr. Kaye), from which the following extract is worthy of note: "As a body the clergy do not sufficiently bear in mind the fact that, side by side with our Church, there has been growing up a numerous body of Christians, many of them able and pious men, but not in connection with it; and that in our efforts to render the Established Church a national Church, we ought to recognize the existence and excellence (albeit with some defects in order and system) of our Nonconforming brethren. The reform which I most desire in the Church is a feeling of Christian fellowship towards these religious bodies, for the anomalous position of which we are in no small degree responsible. I am very fearful of that exclusive spirit which enters so largely into what is called the High school in our Church, and from which even the opposite school is not wholly free."

"There is not one clergyman of the whole list who have just petitioned for a Commission to make doctrinal alterations in the Prayer-Book, who has the most distant intention of giving up his preferment if his recommendation is not attended to. The two parties in the Church now do not dream of separation or secession; they have not the faintest design, either of them, of retiring from the common fold and leaving the rival section in possession of it."—*Times*, January 6.

Lord Ebury, the *Times* goes on to say, must not expect any spirited and warlike support from his constituents who regard him as their leader. There are probably

not half-a-dozen among his clerical partisans who care two straws about the issue, according to any tangible test of solicitude. He also says that it is not probable that any statesman will lend himself to a movement for a doctrinal reform of the English Prayer-Book, which proceeds upon such a weak basis as this. An English statesman has to do with real grievances which cry

earnestly and aloud for remedies, not with themes for comfortable grumbling and with scruples which display such exemplary patience under trial that they rather invite a longer trial than a dangerous cure. The writer thinks that the appointment of a fair representative Commission for a revision of the Prayer-Book would only be the beginning of an endless quarrel.

OBITUARY.

THE LATE REV. WILLIAM HARRISON.

The retired life of a Christian minister cannot offer much to interest the general reader, and can scarcely solicit more than the passing glance of curiosity or respect. It is in the family alone that the reminiscences are held sacred, and in the affections of children that the obituary is truly written. Yet it is proper to record the death of one who had spent a long life in the advocacy of Unitarian doctrines and the teachings of religion, and whose ancestors had for many generations been consistent in the maintenance of rational Christianity.

The Rev. Wm. Harrison died on Nov. 30th, at Higher Broughton, near Manchester, in the 81st year of his age. He had been for upwards of 50 years the minister of a small chapel at Blackley, near Manchester, where he had gained the affections of his congregation by the kindness of his disposition and his unvarying affability to the poor. Mr. Harrison was descended from a highly respectable Lancashire family. It may be remembered that his father was co-pastor with Dr. Barnes at the Unitarian chapel in Cross Street, Manchester. The advantages which might have been derived from his social position never seduced him from the humble line of life which he considered to be his fitting destination. Though of literary tastes and fond of studious retirement, Mr. Harrison was not much known as an author. He was perhaps too distrustful of his own abilities to devote himself to original inquiries. He published a posthumous volume of his father's sermons, and also a second edition of the excellent English Grammar which emanated from the same pen. The former work has prefixed to it a brief memoir of the Rev. Ralph Harrison, which may be considered as a fair specimen of his style of composition. The latter period of Mr. Harrison's life made large demands on the Christian fortitude which it had been the business of his life to inculcate on others. A long illness rendered him incapable of moving from his chamber,

and finally denied him the solace which he had so long found in reading. He bore all with meekness and patience, without one word of repining against the will of the Most High. He had always a smile of welcome for the friends who visited him, and a cordial grasp of affection greeted their taking leave.

He was interred by the Rev. W. Gaskell, M.A., on the 5th of December, 1859, at Blackley, which was the seat of his labours, and on the following Sunday an able discourse was preached by the same gentleman from the words, "And thou shalt go to thy Father's in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age."

J. B. H.

Jan. 3, at his residence, Fordham, Cambridgeshire, after long and severe illness, Mr. ROBERT D. FYSON. He was a skilled and scientific farmer, and a man of vigorous sense and of kind and generous dispositions. He and his excellent father were among the early friends of the late Rev. Robert Aspland, who was born in the neighbouring village of Wicken. The friendship continued unbroken during life, and the memory of their father's friend is now affectionately cherished by the children of him who was first called away.

Dec. 7, in the 66th year of her age, ANN, widow of the late Jeremiah LEES, Esq., of Kelsall House, Stalybridge.

Dec. 11, Rev. W. DAVIES, Ph.D., Tutor in Hebrew and the Mathematics at the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen. His good sense, amiability and moderation, made him respected and beloved alike by colleagues and pupils and friends.

Dec. 26, after a short illness, EMMA, wife of John S. DRENNAN, Esq., M.D., of Belfast, and daughter of Rev. W. Hincks, of Toronto, aged 33.

Dec. 29, Mr. CHAS. CHATFIELD CLARKE, East Street, Chichester.

Dec. 29, at Preston, aged 37, ROBERT PRESTON RODICK, Esq., of Woodclose, Westmoreland, Justice of the Peace for the county of Lancaster.

Dec. 31, at Streatham Paragon, Brixton Hill, SAMUEL SANGSTER, Esq., in his 82nd year.

Jan. 3, at Shepton Mallet, Somerset, after a few hours' illness, Mrs. ANN NAYLER, wife of Rev. John Nayler, minister of the Cowl-Street chapel in that town, aged 66 years.

Jan. 4, at Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, MARY ANN, widow of the late Mr. John SHORT, aged 68 years.

Jan. 8, aged 59, MARY, wife of Mr. Thomas HANDS, of York.

Jan. 12, at the house of her sister, 24, Regent Street, St. James's, Miss SARAH CARPENTER, youngest daughter of the late Mr. George Carpenter, in the 71st year of her age.

Jan. 19, at Chester, in his eighth year, EDWARD HENRY, son of Mr. Edward JOHN-SON, of Abbot's Cottage, Chester.

Jan. 21, at Leamington, Rev. BENJAMIN CARPENTER, of Nottingham. [We request some one of the many friends of this useful and excellent minister to furnish us with a Memoir of his public life.]

Jan. 21, at his residence, Hyde, Cheshire, in his 59th year, Mr. SAMUEL HIBBERT. Gifted with good sense and a clear judgment, his temper amiable and his whole character well balanced, he made himself throughout life eminently useful and respected. Devoting himself to business in the cotton manufacture, by his steady application and unswerving integrity he attained a position of usefulness and influence, beloved by those whom he employed and respected by all the employers of his neighbourhood. To the members of the family to which he belonged and to all who had any claim upon him, the counsels of his natural sagacity and experience were ever freely given. His death makes a void which will not be easily filled. He was, as his father had been before him, a firm friend of civil and religious liberty, and throughout his life rendered liberal assistance, both by his personal influence and his pecuniary aid, to whatever would promote good government, liberal principles and sound education. Avoiding all violent extremes, he was one on whom his friends

knew that they could always confidently rely in every question where a principle was at stake. In the movement which resulted in the emancipation of trade from protective restrictions, he was a zealous fellow-labourer. His last public act was to encourage by his presence at a meeting of the inhabitants of Hyde (at which he took the chair and gave a liberal subscription) the formation of a Rifle Corps. In religion he was from personal conviction a Unitarian Christian. As a member of the zealous society at Gee Cross, he was always forward in every good congregational work. His removal from the scene of usefulness which he adorned by his unostentatious virtues was sudden. Prostrated by unexpected disease, he learnt from his medical advisers that the sands of life were rapidly running down; he received the intelligence with the calmness of a Christian's fortitude, and employed the few remaining minutes of life in an act of brotherly forethought and love. To the warmly-attached members of his family, his departure is a cause of lasting sorrow.

REV. GEORGE HARRIS.

In our last No. we announced the sad event of the death of this eminent and popular minister. Of the impressive scene of his funeral we do not intend now to dwell; deeper sorrow affecting a larger number of persons on any public occasion we have rarely seen. We have the melancholy satisfaction of announcing that a Memoir of Mr. Harris's public life is in hand by a friend able to do full justice to the task, and will be given in our pages. We hope the first portion of it will appear in our next No.

From several of the pulpits of our ministers appropriate tributes to Mr. Harris's public services have been paid. The following, by Rev. Edmund Kell, of Southampton, has been placed in our hands:

"While speaking of the responsibility of life, and our duty to employ its fleeting moments to our highest, our spiritual benefit, my thoughts will turn to a life which has now passed from among us to its everlasting reward—I refer to the Rev. George Harris, of Newcastle-on-Tyne. To some among you, the high qualities of this eminent being, either as a man amongst men or as a minister of the gospel, are well known. As a man, his sterling independence, moral courage and integrity, united with true, warm-hearted friendship and Christian philanthropy, commanded for him the affection and respect, not only of those who thought and laboured with him in the great sympathies of life,

but of many who differed widely from him in religious and political opinion. As a preacher, I need hardly say to you that he possessed the highest characteristics of an orator; for his masculine understanding, strength of reasoning and tenderness of feeling, were well sustained by his admirable elocution and noble, manly bearing. He was through life the unvarying friend of civil and religious liberty in all its shades and ramifications, and in some instances was eminently instrumental in promoting its great objects. A sermon of his against the Tithe system, preached in consequence of the massacre by the soldiery in the seizure of tithes, at Rathcor-mac, went through about twenty editions, and did much to abolish a most obnoxious mode of obtaining that unrighteous impost. In early life he took an active part, in conjunction with Major Cartright, in urging forward a Reform in the House of Commons, going to the very verge of personal danger in his advocacy of a more general representation of the people. He was equally zealous for the repeal of the Corn-laws. But it was as a reformer of our laws of criminal jurisprudence that the Rev. George Harris is perhaps most entitled to the nation's gratitude. As is often the case with those who are the pioneers of improvement, he never had his due meed of praise as the first to popularize the opinion of the impolicy, futility and cruelty of death punishment. In labours for the diffusion of more clement views touching the treatment of offenders, at a time when an almost incredible number of offences were punished with death, he went through many of the large towns of England and Scotland, and often, midst obloquy and opposition, lectured against capital punishment; and by the force of his strong, clear reasoning and powerful eloquence, attracted large audiences, sometimes, as in the Birmingham Town-hall, amounting to three thousand. It is not too much to say that the public mind was on this question much influenced by his appeals; for though the principles he advocated had been successfully laid down by various jurisprudents in their writings, it was mainly reserved for him to bring them forward for the appreciation and acceptance of the people. The efforts of the Rev. G. Harris for the abolition of slavery, and more recently in forwarding sanitary reform, were alike persevering and energetic, and only less conspicuous because others participated in the philanthropic labour of forming on these points a more enlightened public sentiment. But the reform which was always nearest and dearest to this Christian pastor's heart, and

to the accomplishment of which he most consecrated his powers, was *religious* reform—the clearing away the corruptions of Christianity, the restoration of the gospel of Christ to the purity in which it was bequeathed by its great Founder and his apostles. This reform was ever to him a sacred duty, even from the period when, as a student of Glasgow University, he went on Sundays to Greenock to plant the standard of Unitarian Christianity in that town, to the time when, only two days before that last pulpit service in which his strength failed him, he penned to me perhaps his last letter, which concludes with the words, 'The *missionary* spirit goes *bravely* on in Lancashire, Cheshire, Yorkshire and Derbyshire.' When he first settled as a minister in Lancashire, he entered with zeal on the missionary labours at a time when the general body of Unitarians were not altogether ripe for the enterprise. He continued ever after to be the life and soul of missionary efforts, and his valuable ministerial services were often put in requisition by those of his brother ministers who sympathized with him on the importance of diffusing the opinions which seemed to them most accordant with the 'truth as it is in Jesus.' Chiefly to urge forward the missionary movement, he published for twenty years a monthly religious periodical, intended 'to uphold the great doctrines of the Reformation, the sufficiency of Scripture, the right of private judgment and of fearless free inquiry,' which, meeting a popular want, had considerable circulation, and was sustained by him with zealous though often unrequited labour. After its discontinuance, he edited another monthly religious periodical, entitled, 'The Christian Pilot.' Those only who have engaged in such publications can fully estimate the anxiety and trouble they entail, and the gratitude due from the public to the generous zeal which conducts them.

"That earnestness of devotion to the diffusion of Christian truth which gave so much heart and efficacy to his own pulpit exhortations, he lived to see become the *feeling* with which almost all the earnest men of our body are more and more impressed, and it rejoiced his heart to witness the missionary efforts of many of our churches. It was my privilege to visit him during his illness not many weeks before his death, and to hear him speak with a glow of animation of those better and brighter times coming when the superstitions and false doctrines encrusted on the truths of Christianity shall disappear, and the gospel light shall shine in its unsullied and unrivalled purity.

“But let not any suppose that the Rev. George Harris was one of those who in his conversations or pulpit ministrations was always dwelling on points of discordant faith. No! These he brought forward at suitable times when the exigency of the occasion required it. But the secret of his great success and strength through life was, that the *affirmative* doctrines of the gospel were preached by him in all their holy importance, that the ever-beaming love of our Heavenly Father in sending his Son into the world to call sinners to repentance was ever prominent, that he was ever ready to extend the soothing invitation to the sinner to return to his Father's house. There was no barrenness in the pasture to which for so many years he invited his successive flocks at Liverpool, Bolton, Glasgow, Edinburgh and Newcastle, or he could not have so carried with him the hearts and affections of his people. It was the great practical truths and precepts of the gospel on which he most delighted to dwell, swaying the hearts of men all the more powerfully because not weakened and overborne by human traditions or superstitions or a spurious philosophy.

“That eloquent tongue is now mute. That philanthropic breast has ceased to glow. That powerful arm is no longer upraised in the cause of religion and philanthropy. But we will fondly cherish the hope that others, looking on what he has done for his ‘day and generation,’ will strive to walk in his footsteps. We will send up the fervent prayer which our Saviour taught us to offer, that our God would ‘send forth more labourers into his vineyard.’ And, above all, O! let us one and all resolve to copy his spirit, and to battle manfully for that sacred cause of gospel truth and righteousness, in labouring for which the brother we have lost left us so bright an example! Amen.”

The Rev. R. B. Drummond delivered a discourse in St. Mark's chapel, Edinburgh, on New-year's-day, in which he alluded to the important and valuable labours of the Rev. George Harris for the promotion of Unitarianism in Scotland. The preacher thus referred to his stay in Edinburgh: “To you, my beloved friends, the intelligence of the decease of your former pastor will have come as a grief and a pain. It is now nearly twenty years since he became your minister. In the year 1841, he removed from Glasgow to this city, where he laboured earnestly and successfully during nearly four years. Often have you heard these walls ring with his eloquent denunciations of what he deemed the soul-oppressing errors of the prevailing religion, with his earnest appeals in behalf of truth,

and his emphatic warnings against sin. . . During the course of this last summer you enjoyed the opportunity of once more seeing the familiar form, once more hearing the familiar voice, in the place that formerly had known them both so well. But, alas! not the same power as of old dwelt upon his lips. You saw with sorrow that his energies had declined; but you fondly hoped perhaps that he might still be permitted to continue his labours for some time longer, or at least to live to enjoy the honours of old age. But it seemed otherwise to Providence; and now he is gone—gone, haply in some other sphere to serve his God, and meet his reward in closer communion with the Father of spirits. May the memory of this good man long remain amongst us, to encourage us all to ‘go and do likewise!’”

From Edinburgh also the following letter has been forwarded to Mrs. Harris:

“Edinburgh, January, 1860.

“Dear Madam,—We have been instructed by the Committee of Management of St. Mark's chapel here, to convey to you the feeling of sincere, deep and affectionate sympathy, which the Committee and Congregation entertain towards you and your family in your recent sad bereavement. Our Father in heaven, who doeth all things well, has in His wisdom and love seen fit to release from his labours here below, and to call home to Himself, our venerable, respected and much-loved friend, your dear departed husband. We, too, mourn for him; but we trust it is in the spirit taught to many of us by himself when, as our pastor and friend, he instructed and consoled us in those heavy trials incident to our common lot. His labours of love amongst us then, and also his words fitly spoken, and deeds of kindness done to many of us since, will long remain in our grateful recollection. His name also will ever be remembered and his memory cherished, for the dauntless courage, the fervour, power and eloquence he displayed in the public defence and propagation of our holy and benevolent faith, and which he taught no less effectually by the purity of his life in his private walk and conversation. His unwearied labours from his youth upwards constituted him for many, many years the great preacher in this country of a free and loving Christianity, so that when the history of Christian Unitarianism in Scotland shall come to be written, there will be no name more honoured amongst its first apostles than that of the Rev. George Harris. We will never again see his face or hear the tones of his voice here; he can-

not come to us; but, thanks be to God! we know from the gospel of Jesus that death is only the appointed way to a higher life, and that by a like patient continuance in well-doing, and by the same ceaseless activity in every cause which tends to promote the prosperity, happiness, purity and holiness of our brother man, which so distinguished him, we may encourage the glorious hope of a blissful re-union where sorrow and death shall be no more, and where God himself shall wipe away all tears from our eyes. May He who has promised to be a Husband to the widow and a Father to the fatherless ever com-

fort and sustain you, is the earnest prayer of your attached friends.

"Signed on behalf of the Committee and congregation, by

GEORGE HOPE, Chairman.

ROBERT B. DRUMMOND, Minister.

JOHN H. DUNN, Secretary."

Resolutions have been passed on the subject of Mr. Harris's services to our cause by the Newcastle congregation and by the Unitarian Association. The funeral address and sermon are, at the request of the Newcastle congregation, about to be sent to the press.

MARRIAGES.

Nov. 23, in the church of the First Presbyterian congregation, Rosemary Street, Belfast, by Rev. William Bruce, assisted by Rev. J. Scott Porter, SAMUEL BARBOUR, of New York, to MARGARET AULD, second daughter of John RIDDEL, Esq., of Beechmount, Belfast.

Nov. 27, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JAMES HOPE to ANN, daughter of Mr. J. BROWN, of Bolton.

Nov. 27, at Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, by Rev. Francis Bishop, Mr. JOSEPH FEARN to Miss MARY JANE GOODWIN COOPER, both of Chesterfield.

Dec. 17, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. THOS. AINSWORTH to SARAH, daughter of Mr. Wm. REDFORD, all of Turton, near Bolton.

Dec. 17, in the Unitarian chapel, Portsmouth, by Rev. H. Hawkes, JOHN DAVID THOMSON, of Aldershot, to JULIA BOWERS, of Portsmouth.

Dec. 18, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, JOHN CHADWICK to HENRIETTA THOMPSON, both of Royton, Lancashire.

Dec. 19, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. ISAAC BARROW to HANNAH, daughter of Mr. John TAYLOR, of Bolton.

Dec. 22, at Barton-Street chapel, Gloucester, by Rev. J. G. Teggin, Mr. THOMAS GOODE to Miss SARAH HOOPER, both of that city.

Dec. 24, at the Presbyterian chapel, Newbury, by Rev. R. Shelley, Mr. GEORGE GILE, schoolmaster, of Llandilo Fawt, Carmarthenshire, to Miss CHARLOTTE RAPSON, of Newbury.

Dec. 25, at the Old meeting-house, Nicholas Street, Ipswich, by Rev. J. T. Cooper, Mr. JOHN COOKE, of St. George's Hospital, London, to ELIZA, only daughter of Mr. William FIRTH, Handford House, Ipswich.

Dec. 26, at the Old meeting-house, Ipswich, by Rev. J. T. Cooper, Mr. WALTER J. SCOPES to AGNES, youngest daughter of Mr. Richard GOWING, Victoria Street, Ipswich.

Dec. 27, at the Old meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. Charles Clarke, Mr. EDWIN GRIFFITHS to ROSA, third daughter of the late Mr. Richard TIMMINS, Balsall Heath.

Dec. 27, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Wm. Blazeby, B.A., Mr. WILLIAM NORWEB to MARY, daughter of Mr. Jas. SEDGWICK, both of Nottingham.

Dec. 31, at the High-Pavement chapel, Nottingham, by Rev. Wm. Blazeby, B.A., Mr. WILLIAM ELLIS to ELIZABETH ANN SIMONS.

Jan. 10, at the parish church, Brighton, by Rev. T. Hutchinson, M.A., vicar of Ditchling, Sussex, brother-in-law of the bridegroom, HENRY JOHN BAXTER, Esq., barrister-at-law, of Ladbrooke Square, London, and Gatley, Cheshire, to EMMELINE, daughter of William BAYLEY, Esq., of Stamford Lodge, Stalybridge.

Jan. 11, at Bank-Street chapel, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JOHN WARD, of Turton, to Mrs. ANN WADDELOVE, of Longworth.

Jan. 12, at the Unitarian chapel, Upper Brook Street, by Rev. F. Baker, M.A., JOHN H. M'KEAND, Esq., of Lowton, to MARY BUCKLEY, eldest daughter of the late Peter LIVSEY, Esq., of Barton-upon-Irwell.

Jan. 16, at the Unitarian church, Preston, by Rev. W. O. Squier, Mr. JOHN RIBCHESTER to Miss HANNAH WESTLEY, both of Preston.

Jan. 17, at the parish church, Bolton, by Rev. P. A. Galindo, B.A., assisted by the vicar of Bolton, JOHN LEECH, Jun., Esq., of Stalybridge, to ELIZA, the youngest daughter of Henry ASHWORTH, Esq., the Oaks, near Bolton.